00067308

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Mr. N. B. Daruwala
on 25 February, 2019

FOLK-LORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

FOLK-LORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION LEGEND AND LAW

B 2905

BY

SIR JAMES GEORGE FRAZER

HON. D.C.L., OXFORD; HON. LL.D., GLASGOW; HON. LITT.D., DURHAM
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

67308
ae

IN THREE VOLUMES
VOL. II

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1918

67308

COPYRIGHT

00067308

CONTENTS

PART II

THE PATRIARCHAL AGE

(Continued)

CHAPTER III

JACOB AND THE KIDSKINS: OR THE NEW BIRTH

§ 1. *The Diverted Blessing*

	PAGE
Story of Jacob's trick perhaps a reminiscence of a legal ceremony	1
How Jacob, disguised as his elder brother, obtained the blessing	2
Displacement of an elder by a younger son in the succession	4

§ 2. *Sacrificial Skins in Ritual*

East African tribes in relation to the Semites	4
Fat and skin of animal in Galla rite of adoption	6
Rings made from skins of sacrificial victims in East Africa	7
Kikuyu ceremony of the new birth	7
Assimilation of mother and child to sheep and lamb	10
Sacrificial skins at Kikuyu ceremony of adoption	10
Sacrificial skins at circumcision in East Africa	11
Sacrificial skins at marriage in East Africa	12
Sacrificial skins at covenants in East Africa	13
Sacrificial skins in another Kikuyu rite	15
Sacrificial skins at sacrifices in East Africa	16
Sacrificial skins in sickness, etc., in East Africa	18
Sacrificial skins at expiations among the Wachaga	20
Sacrificial skins at expiations among the Akikuyu	23
Sacrificial skins at expiations among the Wawanga	24
Sacrificial skins at transference of government in East Africa	25
Victim's skin intended to identify the wearer with the animal	26
Passing a child through a skin ring in Madagascar	27

§ 3. *The New Birth*

PAGE

Legal fiction of a new birth to effect a change of status . . . 27
Fiction of new birth at adoption in antiquity and the Middle Ages . 28
Fiction of new birth at adoption among Slavs and Turks . . . 29
Fiction of new birth at adoption among the Klemantans . . . 29
Fiction of new birth at adoption among the Bahima . . . 30
Fiction of new birth enacted in Greece and India by persons erroneously thought to be dead 31
Fiction of new birth to raise a Brahman to the rank of a god . . 32
Fiction of new birth in India as expiation for breach of custom . . 33
Fiction of new birth from a metal cow as expiation in India . . 34
Fiction of new birth from a golden cow to raise Maharajahs of Travancore to Brahman rank 35
Fiction of new birth from a live cow in India 37
Rite of new birth tends to dwindle into an abridged form . . . 38

§ 4. *Conclusion*

Jacob and the kidskins in relation to the rite of the new birth . . 39

CHAPTER IV

JACOB AT BETHEL

§ 1. *Jacob's Dream*

Jacob sent away to Laban in Haran 40
His dream of the heavenly ladder at Bethel 41
The stone at Bethel set up and anointed 41

§ 2. *Dreams of the Gods*

Belief that gods reveal themselves to men in dreams . . . 42
Dreams in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus . . . 43
Dreams in the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Epidaurus . . . 44
Dream oracle of Ino or Pasiphae in Laconia 50
Dream oracles in ancient Italy 51

§ 3. *The Heavenly Ladder*

African tales of heavenly ladders 52
Toradja tales of creepers connecting earth and heaven . . . 52
Stories of heavenly ladder, etc., in Sumatra, Madagascar, and Russia . 53
Ladders to facilitate the descent of gods or spirits . . . 55
Ladders in graves for the dead to climb up 57

§ 4. *The Sacred Stone*

PAGE
Popularity of the sanctuary at Bethel 58
Sacred stones at Canaanite and Hebrew sanctuaries . . . 59
Stones worshipped by the ancient Arabs and Greeks . . . 59
Worship of stones in the Banks' Islands and New Hebrides . . 60
Worship of stones in the Torres Straits Islands 63
Worship of stones in Samoa 64
Worship of stones in Bowditch Island and Nukunau . . . 64
Worship of stones in the Indian Archipelago 65
Worship of stones among the Karens of Burma 66
Worship of stones among the Semas of Assam 66
Worship of stones in India 67
Worship of stones in China and the Caucasus 67
Worship of stones in Madagascar and Africa 68
Worship of stones among the North American Indians . . . 69
The Gruagach stones in the highlands of Scotland . . . 72
Sacred stones anointed in Norway 72
Sacred stones anointed in classical antiquity 72
Sacred stones anointed in India 73
Sacred stones anointed in the Kei Islands, Madagascar, and Africa . 74
The anointed stone at Bethel 76
Many Bethels (*baitylia*) in Canaan 76
The standing stones (*massẹboth*) of Canaanite sanctuaries . . . 77

CHAPTER V

JACOB AT THE WELL

§ 1. *Watering the Flocks*

Jacob's meeting with Rachel at the well 78
Watering the flocks at wells in modern Palestine 79
Women as shepherdesses in Palestine and Arabia . . . 81

§ 2. *Weeping as a Salutation*

The weeping of Jacob at meeting Rachel 82
Weeping at the meeting of friends in the Old Testament . . . 83
Weeping at meeting among the Maoris 84
Weeping as a salutation in the Andaman Islands and India . . 86
Weeping as a salutation among the American Indians . . . 87
Such salutations perhaps meant to effect a corporeal union . . 90
Initiation of a scavenger in the Punjab 90
Spittle at initiation among the Baluba 91
Spittle at covenanting and saluting in East Africa . . . 92
The springs of tears and laughter 93

CHAPTER VI

JACOB'S MARRIAGE

§ 1. *Jacob and his two Wives*

PAGE

Different motives assigned for Jacob's journey to Haran . . . 94
Aversion of Jews to marriage with strange women . . . 95
Jacob's marriage with his cousins in accordance with common custom . 97

§ 2. *The Marriage of Cousins*

Distinction between *cross-cousins*, who are marriageable, and *ortho-cousins*, who are not marriageable 98

§ 3. *The Marriage of Cousins in India*

Distinction in respect of cousin-marriage between Aryans and aborigines . 99
Marriage of cousins forbidden by Hindoo law 100
Marriage of cross-cousins commonly preferred among the aborigines . 100
Marriage with mother's brother's daughter in Southern India . . 101
Cross-cousin marriage among the Dravidians 102
Cross-cousin marriage in Ceylon and Cochin 102
Cross-cousin marriage among the Todas 103
Cross-cousin marriage among the Tamil-speaking Dravidians . . 104
Marriage with a niece in Southern India 109
Cross-cousin marriage among the Telugu-speaking Dravidians . . 109
Mēnarikam, marriage with a mother's brother's daughter . . . 110
Marriage with a cross-cousin or a niece in Mysore 113
Cross-cousin marriage among the Canarese-speaking Dravidians . . 117
Cross-cousin marriage among Oriya-speaking castes of Southern India . 117
Cross-cousin marriage among Brahmans in Southern India . . 119
Cross-cousin marriage in Central and Northern India . . . 120
Cross-cousin marriage among the Gonds 120
Tendency to prefer marriage with father's sister's daughter . . 121
Economic motive for marriage with mother's brother's daughter . . 124
Marriage with father's sister's daughter forbidden in some castes . . 124
Economic motives for marriage with a cross-cousin . . . 125
Preference for one of the two forms of cross-cousin marriage . . 126
Cross-cousin marriage among the Kotvalias of Baroda . . . 127
Cross-cousin marriage among Dravidian tribes of Mirzapur . . 128
Cross-cousin marriage among Bhotiyas of Northern India . . . 129
Cross-cousin marriage in the Punjab 130
Cross-cousin marriage among Mohammedans of N.W. India . . 130
Cross-cousin marriage among aboriginal tribes of Bengal . . . 131
Cross-cousin marriage among Mongoloid tribes of Chittagong and Assam . 132

§ 4. *The Marriage of Cousins in other Parts of Asia*

PAGE
Cousin marriage practised in other parts of Asia . . . 134
Cross-cousin marriage among the Chins of Burma . . . 135
Cross-cousin marriage among the Singphos or Kachins of Burma . . 136
Cousin marriage among the Karens of Burma 138
Cousin marriage in Southern China and the Malay Peninsula . . 138
Cross-cousin marriage among the Gilyaks 138
Cousin marriage among the tribes of North-Eastern Siberia . . 139

§ 5. *The Marriage of Cousins in America*

Cousin marriage hardly recorded among American aborigines . . 140
Cousin marriage among the Aleuts 141
Cousin marriage among the Eskimo 141
Cross-cousin marriage among the Western Tinnehs . . . 143
Economic motive for marriage with mother's brother's daughter . . 145
Cross-cousin marriage probably once common in North America . . 146
Cross-cousin marriage among the Indians of the Antilles and South America 148

§ 6. *The Marriage of Cousins in Africa*

Cross-cousin marriage common in Africa 149
Cross-cousin marriage among the Herero 150
Cousin marriage among the Bantus of South-East Africa . . . 150
Cousin marriage among the Nyanja-speaking tribes of Rhodesia . . 151
Cross-cousin marriage among the Awemba of Rhodesia . . . 153
Cousin marriage forbidden among the Winamwanga . . . 154
Cousin marriage forbidden in some tribes of Rhodesia . . . 155
Cross-cousin marriage among the Wahehe and Wagogo . . . 156
Cross-cousin marriage in West Africa and Egypt 157
Cousin marriage in Madagascar 157
The marriage of all first cousins forbidden among the Baganda, Banyoro, Basoga, and Bateso 159
Cross-cousins obliged to avoid each other among the Baganda . . 160
Inference from avoidance of cross-cousins among the Baganda . . 161
Marriage of cousins forbidden among the Akikuyu . . . 161
Expiation for marriage of cousins among the Akikuyu . . . 162
Marriage of cousins forbidden among the Thonga . . . 162
Expiation for marriage of cousins among the Thonga . . . 163
The bond of kinship conceived as physical 163
Marriage of cousins barred among Wabemba and Wahorohoro . . 164
Marriage of cousins barred among the Masai 164
Expiation for marriage of cousins among the Masai . . . 165
Marriage of cousins barred among the Yorubas 165

§ 7. *The Marriage of Cousins in the Indian Archipelago*

PAGE
Cross-cousin marriage in Sumatra 165
Cross-cousin marriage in the Kei Islands 167
Cross-cousin marriage in islands between New Guinea and Celebes . 167
Cousin marriage in Celebes 169
Expiation for marriage with cousin once removed in Celebes . . 170
Marriage of cousins barred among some peoples of Celebes . . 171
Expiation for marriage of cousins in Celebes 171
Marriage of cousins barred in Java 172
Marriage of cousins barred in British Borneo 172
Expiation for marriage of cousins in Borneo 173
Marriage of cousins barred in Dutch Borneo 174

§ 8. *The Marriage of Cousins in New Guinea and the Torres Straits Islands*

Marriage of first cousins discountenanced in New Guinea . . . 175
Marriage of first cousins discountenanced in Torres Straits . . 177
Cross-cousin marriage common in the Trobriand Islands . . . 177

§ 9. *The Marriage of Cousins in Melanesia*

Cross-cousin marriage in New Caledonia 177
Cross-cousin marriage in the New Hebrides 178
Cross-cousin marriage in the Torres Islands 179
Cross-cousin marriage in Fiji 180
Ortho-cousins obliged to avoid each other in Fiji . . . 181
Marriage of first cousins forbidden in the Banks' Islands . . . 182
Marriage of first cousins forbidden in New Ireland . . . 183
Cross-cousins obliged to avoid each other in New Ireland . . 183

§ 10. *The Marriage of Cousins in Polynesia*

Marriage of cousins discountenanced in Polynesia . . . 184
Trace of cross-cousin marriage in Tonga 184
Second cousins allowed to marry in Rotuma 185
Marriage even of distant cousins rare in Mangaia . . . 185

§ 11. *The Marriage of Cousins in Australia*

Marriage of cousins preferred in some tribes and forbidden in others . 186
Cross-cousin marriage among the Urabunna 187
Cross-cousin marriage in Victoria and New South Wales . . . 187
Cross-cousin marriage in Queensland and N.W. Australia . . 188
Marriage of children of cross-cousins among the Dieri . . . 189
Contrast between Dieri and Urabunna customs 190
Marriage of ortho-cousins always barred by two-class exogamy . . 191
Marriage of children of cross-cousins among the Mardudhunera . . 191
Marriage of all cousins forbidden in some Australian tribes . . 192
Divergence of custom in regard to cousin-marriage in Australia . . 193

§ 12. *Why is the Marriage of Cross-Cousins favoured?*

PAGE
Why is cross-cousin marriage favoured and ortho-cousin marriage forbidden? 193
Economic motive for cousin-marriage among the Australian aborigines . 194
Economic value of a wife among the Australian aborigines . . 194
A wife generally obtained in exchange for a sister or daughter . . 195
Exchange of sisters or daughters for wives in South Australia . . 196
Exchange of sisters or daughters for wives in Victoria and New South Wales 197
Commercial value of women in aboriginal Australia . . . 198
The rape of women from other tribes comparatively rare . . . 199
By exchange old men get most of the young women for themselves . 200
Sisters or daughters usually given in exchange for wives . . . 202
Exchange of sisters probably older than exchange of daughters . . 203
Cross-cousin marriage a natural consequence of exchange of sisters in marriage 205
Cross-cousin marriage probably older than the recognition of paternity . 205
Suggested origin of cross-cousin marriage confirmed by the practice of the Kariera 206
Double-cross cousins and single-cross cousins 207
Cross-cousin marriage in Australia probably everywhere an effect of the exchange of sisters in marriage 209
The exchange of sisters in marriage probably the source of cross-cousin marriage elsewhere 209
Cross-cousin marriage and exchange of sisters in Southern India . . 210
Economic advantage of exchange of sisters in marriage . . . 210
Cross-cousin marriage and exchange of sisters among the Bhotiyas . 212
Cross-cousin marriage and exchange of sisters among the Garos . . 213
Cousin marriage and exchange of daughters in Baluchistan . . 213
Cross-cousin marriage not a necessary effect of exchange of sisters or daughters 214
Exchange of sisters in marriage in Torres Straits 214
Exchange of sisters in marriage in New Guinea 214
Exchange of daughters in marriage among the Santals of Bengal . . 217
Exchange of daughters in marriage among the tribes of the French Sudan 218
Exchange of daughters in marriage in Sumatra 218
Exchange of daughters in marriage in Palestine 219
Probability that cross-cousin marriage originated in the exchange of sisters or daughters as wives 220

§ 13. *Why is the marriage of Ortho-Cousins forbidden?*

Marriage of ortho-cousins prevented by the dual organization or the system of two exogamous classes 221
Dual organization probably everywhere at one time co-existent with cross-cousin marriage 222
Prevalence of dual organization attested by totemism and the classificatory system of relationship 222
Totemism as evidence of the dual organization 223

PAGE
Totemic exogamy prevents marriage of ortho-cousins in some cases . 223
Totemic exogamy less comprehensive than two-class exogamy . . 225
Totemic exogamy probably everywhere derived from two-class exogamy . 226
The classificatory system of relationship as evidence of the dual organization 227
The classificatory system, a system of relationship between groups . 227
The classificatory system extends the choice of wives . . . 229
The classificatory system of relationship reflects a system of group marriage 230
In Australia the classificatory system based on two-class exogamy . 231
The classificatory system not affected by the four- and eight-class exogamy found in some Australian tribes 232
Intention of successive divisions into two, four, and eight exogamous classes 232
Two-class exogamy intended to bar marriage of brothers with sisters . 233
Two-class exogamy systematized the marriage of cross-cousins . . 234
Two-class exogamy barred the marriage of ortho-cousins 235
Preference for cross-cousin marriage probably older than two-class exogamy 235
Two-class exogamy derived from aversion to marriage of near kin . 236
This derivation confirmed by comparison of rules as to cross-cousin marriage among the Urabunna, Dieri, and Arunta . . . 236
Cross-cousin marriage barred by eight-class exogamy among the Aruñta . 237
Marriage of parents with children barred by four-class exogamy . . 238
Cross-cousin marriage not barred by four-class exogamy . . . 239
Traces of dual organization coincident with cross-cousin marriage . . 240
The coincidence among the Dravidians of India 241
The coincidence in other races of Asia and America . . . 241
The coincidence in Africa 242
The coincidence in the Indian Archipelago 243
The coincidence in Melanesia 244
The coincidence in Australia 244
Preference for cross-cousin marriage and prohibition of ortho-cousin marriage probably everywhere connected with dual organization . 245
Growing aversion evinced to marriage of near kin . . . 245

§ 14. *An alternative Explanation of Cross-cousin Marriage*

Other causes of cross-cousin marriage possible 246
Different theory of cross-cousin marriage proposed by Dr. Rivers . . 247
Anomalous forms of marriage in Melanesia 247
Dr. Rivers' explanation of these anomalous marriages . . . 248
Dr. Rivers derives cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia from marriage with mother's brother's wife 250
Objections to this theory as a general explanation of cross-cousin marriage 251
Marriage with mother's brother's wife among the Garos rather effect than cause of cross-cousin marriage 252
Economic motive of cross-cousin marriage among the Garos . . 254

§ 15. *Cousin Marriage among the Arabs*

PAGE

Preference for marriage with an ortho-cousin, the daughter of a father's brother 255
Preference for marriage with father's brother's daughter among the Arabs 255
Cousin marriage among the Arabs of Moab 257
Cousin marriage among the Arabs of Egypt 258
Marriage with the father's brother's daughter in Morocco . . 259
Marriage with the father's brother's daughter among the Hausas . . 260
Preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter not derived from the dual organization 260
Wilken's theory that such marriages originated in ignorance of paternity . 261
Robertson Smith's theory that such marriages originated in fraternal polyandry 261
Marriage with the father's brother's daughter probably later than cross-cousin marriage and based on economic motives . . . 262

§ 16. *The Sororate and the Levirate*

Jacob's marriage with his cousins 263
Jacob's marriage with two sisters in their lifetime . . . 264
Custom of marrying several sisters in order of seniority . . . 264
The sororate and the levirate 264
The sororate and the levirate complementary customs . . . 265
The sororate and levirate among the Indians of North America . . 266
The sororate and levirate among the Indians of South America . . 274
The sororate and levirate in Africa 275
The sororate and levirate in Madagascar 284
Brothers marry in order of seniority among the Kafirs . . . 284
Brothers and sisters marry in order of seniority in India . . . 285
Ancient Indian law on seniors marrying before juniors . . . 286
Order of seniority in marriage observed among the South Slavs . . 287
Reminiscences of the order of seniority in Britain . . . 288
Order of seniority in marriage in China, the East Indies, and Africa . 290
The sororate and order of seniority in modern India . . . 291
The sororate and levirate in modern India 293
The sororate and levirate among the tribes of Assam . . . 296
The sororate and levirate among other Asiatic peoples . . . 297
Marriage with deceased wife's sister among Cheremiss and Mordvins . 298
The sororate and levirate in the Indian Archipelago . . . 298
The sororate and levirate in Torres Straits, New Guinea, and the Lousiades 299
The sororate and levirate in the New Hebrides 300
The sororate and levirate in Polynesia and Micronesia . . . 301
The sororate and levirate in Australia 303
Probable origin of the sororate and levirate in the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters 304
This form of group marriage in Australia and India . . . 304
Santal marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters . . 306

PAGE
This form of group marriage combines the sororate and levirate . . 308
Parallel between the Santal and the Thonga system . . . 309
Survival of group marriage among the Bhuiyas 310
Origin of the sororate and levirate in group marriage confirmed by the classificatory terms for husband and wife 311
Classificatory terms for husband and wife in Australia . . . 313
Classificatory terms for husband and wife in Melanesia and Polynesia . 315
Classificatory terms for husband and wife among the Gilyaks . . 316
Sororate and levirate derived from group marriage . . . 317
Sororate and levirate limited in regard to seniority . . . 317
Other limitations of marriage in regard to seniority . . . 318
Division of savage communities into age-grades 318
Age-grades among the Kaya-Kaya of New Guinea . . . 318
Age-grades at Bartle Bay in New Guinea 321
Age-grades among tribes of British East Africa 322
Age-grades among the Masai 323
Sexual communism between members of the same age-grade . . 324
Age-grades among the Wataveta 325
Sexual communism between members of the same age-grade . . 326
Sexual relations regulated by age-grades 326
All children borne by a woman after her daughter's marriage put to death 327
Age-grades among the Nandi 328
Ceremonies at circumcision among the Nandi 329
Circumcision and the reincarnation of the dead 330
Circumcision in relation to age-grades 331
Transference of government from one age-grade to another . . 331
Age-grades among the Akamba and Akikuyu 332
Age-grades among the Suk 333
Age-grades among the Turkana 334
Age-grades among the Gallas and in Wadai 335
Association of age-grades with sexual communism . . . 335
Converging evidence of former sexual communism . . . 336
Suggested explanation of prohibition to marry before elder brother or sister 336
Suggested explanation of prohibition to marry daughter of junior uncle or aunt 337
Suggested explanation of prohibition to marry wife's elder sister . . 338
Suggested explanation of prohibition to marry younger brother's widow . 339
Two later types of levirate, the economic and the religious . . 339
The original levirate a product of group marriage . . . 341

§ 17. *Serving for a Wife*

How Jacob served Laban for his two wives 342
Custom of earning a wife by service 342
Serving for a wife in India 343
The Abbé Dubois on serving for a wife in India 347
Serving for a wife in Sikhim and Nepaul 347
Serving for a wife among the tribes of Assam 348

PAGE
Serving for a wife in Burma and Siam 351
Serving for a wife among the aborigines of Indo-China . . . 352
Serving for a wife in Sumatra 353
Serving for a wife in Celebes 355
Serving for a wife among the Tenggeres of Java 357
Serving for a wife among the Kayans of Borneo 358
Serving for a wife in Amboyna, Ceram, etc. 358
Serving for a wife in the Philippine Islands 359
Serving for a wife among the Kamchadales 360
Serving for a wife among the Koryaks 361
Serving for a wife among the Chukchee 361
Serving for a wife among the Yukaghirs 365
Serving for a wife among the Eskimo and Indians of America . . 366
Serving for a wife in Africa 368

§ 18. *Conclusion*

Harmony of Biblical tradition with popular custom . . . 371

CHAPTER VII

JACOB AND THE MANDRAKES

How Rachel conceived through eating mandrakes . . . 372
Belief in the fertilizing virtue of mandrakes in modern Palestine . . 374
Amatory properties ascribed to the mandrake by the Greeks . . 375
Belief in the fertilizing power of mandrakes in Italy, England, and America 376
The mandrake regarded as man-like 377
Artificial mandrakes as charms in modern Europe . . . 378
Bacon and John Parkinson on mandrakes 379
Artificial mandrakes in the East 380
The mandrake supposed to grow under a gallows . . . 381
The mandrake uprooted by a dog 381
Valuable properties ascribed to the mandrake 382
The mandrake as a familiar spirit who brings wealth . . . 383
Superstitions about the mandrake in Wales and England . . . 384
Shakespeare on the mandrake 385
Narcotic property ascribed to the mandrake in antiquity . . . 385
French superstition as to riches brought by mandrakes . . . 386
The use of a dog to uproot the mandrake 387
Apuleius Platonicus on the uprooting of the mandrake . . . 388
The use of a dog to uproot the *aglaophotis* or peony . . . 388
Arab superstitions about the mandrake 390
Josephus on the uprooting of the *baaras* by a dog . . . 390
The *baaras* perhaps the sulphur-plant 391
The *baaras* possibly the mandrake 392
Jewish legend as to the mandrake and the ass 393

PAGE
Hebrew and Homeric treatment of crudities in legend . . . 394
Function of the dog in the mandrake superstition . . . 394
Armenian parallel 395
Personification of the mandrake 395
Dog employed to uproot other plants 396
Supposed rage of plants at being uprooted 396
Survival in poets of the primitive personification of plants . . 397

CHAPTER VIII

THE COVENANT ON THE CAIRN

Jacob's return to the land of his fathers 398
His dispute with Laban 400
The reconciliation and covenant at the cairn 401
The cairn personified as a witness 401
Rude stone monuments beyond Jordan 402
Stones employed to give stability to covenants 403
The stone at marriage in India 404
Oaths on stones in Scotland 405
Oaths on stones in Africa and India 406
Religious and magical uses of stones in oaths 407
Twofold aspect of the cairn in Jacob's covenant 407
Procopius on a detection of perjury 408
Cairns as witnesses in modern Syria 409

CHAPTER IX

JACOB AT THE FORD OF THE JABBOK

Jacob's descent into the glen of the Jabbok 410
Jacob's wrestle with a mysterious adversary at the ford . . . 411
His adversary perhaps the jinnee of the river 412
The wrestling of Greek heroes with water-sprites . . . 412
Shape-shifting in such encounters 413
Propitiation of water-spirits at fords 414
Rivers worshipped by Bantu tribes of South Africa . . . 415
Offerings to rivers at crossing them in Africa 417
Ceremonies at crossing rivers in South India 419
Chiefs and kings forbidden to cross certain rivers 420
Ceremonies of the Angoni at crossing a river 420
Punishments inflicted on river-spirits 421
Punishing or fighting the spirits of the sea 422
The sinew that shrank; American Indian parallels . . . 423
Ancient Mexican parallel to Jacob's nocturnal wrestle . . . 424

CHAPTER X

JOSEPH'S CUP

PAGE
Joseph's divining cup 426
Divination by appearances in water in antiquity 426
Divination by appearances in water or ink in modern Egypt . . 427
Divination by appearances in water in Scandinavia and Tahiti . . 429
Divination by appearances in water in the Malay Peninsula, New Guinea, Africa, and among the Eskimo 430
Vision of gods in water contrived by ancient oracle-mongers . . 431
Other ways of divining by a vessel of water 431
Divination by things dropped into water 432
Divination by tea-leaves in a cup 432
Divination by molten lead or wax in water 433

PART III

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES AND THE KINGS

CHAPTER I

MOSES IN THE ARK OF BULRUSHES

National history of Israel begins with Moses 437
Exposure and preservation of the infant Moses 438
Exposure and preservation of Semiramis 440
Exposure and preservation of Gilgamus 440
Exposure and preservation of Cyrus 441
Exposure and preservation of Perseus 444
Exposure and preservation of Telephus 445
Exposure and preservation of Aegisthus 446
Exposure and preservation of Oedipus 446
Exposure and preservation of Romulus 447
Exposure and preservation of Sargon 450
Exposure and preservation of Prince Karna in the *Mahabharata* . . 451
Exposure and preservation of Trakhan, king of Gilgit . . . 452
Water ordeal to test the legitimacy of children 454

CHAPTER II

THE PASSAGE THROUGH THE RED SEA

Passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea 456

PAGE
Passage of Alexander the Great through the Pamphylian Sea . . 457
Passage of a Roman storming-party through the sea at New Carthage . 459
African stories of miraculous passages through water . . . 461

CHAPTER III

THE WATERS OF MERIBAH

How Moses produced water from a rock with his staff . . . 463
How Dori produced water from a rock with his spear . . . 463

CHAPTER IV

GIDEON'S MEN

Gideon commanded to deliver Israel from Midian . . . 465
The deliverers chosen for their mode of drinking water . . . 466
Throwing water into the mouth in Africa 467
Throwing water into the mouth in Cambodia, Samoa, and New Caledonia 468
Throwing water into the mouth in the New Hebrides 468
Reason for this mode of drinking 469
An incident in the wars of Massachusetts 469

CHAPTER V

JOTHAM'S FABLE

How Abimelech made himself king of Shechem 471
How Jotham spoke to the men of Shechem 471
His fable of the bramble as king of the trees 472
Rivalry between the trees in Aesop's fables 473
Callimachus on the rivalry of the laurel and olive . . . 473
Rivalry between the trees in an Armenian fable 476
Rivalry between plants in a Malay story 477
Jotham's fable inserted in mediaeval collections 478

CHAPTER VI

SAMSON AND DELILAH

Incongruity of Samson among the judges 480
The home country of Samson 481
Samson's strength in his hair: the secret betrayed . . . 482
Belief in East Indies that a man's strength is in his hair . . . 484

PAGE
Belief in Europe that the power of a witch is in her hair . . . 485
Similar belief as to witches in India and Mexico 486
Niasian story of king whose strength was in his hair . . . 486
Ballad of Lord Soulis and his charmed life 488
Ancient Greek stories like that of Samson and Delilah . . . 490
Russian story of Koshchei the Deathless 491
Serbian story of the warlock True Steel 493
Serbian story of the dragon of the mill 494
Islay story of the giant and the egg 495
Argyleshire story of the giant and the thorn 496
Indian story of the ogre king of Gilgit 497
Resemblance of all these stories to the Samson legend . . . 501
Transposition of the hero and the villain 501
The harlequins of history 502

CHAPTER VII

THE BUNDLE OF LIFE

The wilderness of Judea 503
David and Abigail 504
"The bundle of life" 505
Belief that souls can be abstracted from their bodies . . . 506
Souls extracted to keep them out of harm's way 507
Bundles of sticks and stones as receptacles of souls in Central Australia . 508
Analogy of these bundles to "the bundle of life" . . . 510
Ezekiel on women who hunt and catch souls 510
The art of hunting and catching souls 511
Trapping souls in Celebes 512
"Houses of the soul" denounced by Isaiah 513
"Houses of the soul" perhaps scent-bottles 515
Folk-lore and poetry 516

CHAPTER VIII

THE WITCH OF ENDOR

Saul and Samuel 517
The character of Saul 517
The eve of battle 519
Saul resolves to consult the ghost of Samuel 519
Saul and the witch of Endor 520
Necromancy among the ancient Hebrews 522
Necromancy in the Gilgamesh epic 525
Necromancy among the ancient Greeks 525
The oracles of the dead 526
The oracle of Aornum in Thesprotis 526

PAGE
Oracles imparted by the dead in dreams 528
Dream oracle of the dead in Italy 529
Dream oracles on graves in North Africa 530
Dream oracles on graves in Celebes 530
Evocation of the ghosts of Darius, Achilles, and Homer . . . 530
Lucan on the evocation of the dead 531
Horace and Tibullus on the evocation of the dead . . . 532
Evocation of the dead by Nero and Caracalla 532
Necromancy in Africa 533
Oracles of dead kings among the Baganda 533
Oracles of dead kings among the Banyoro 534
Oracles of dead chiefs among the Basoga 534
Oracles of dead chiefs among the Bantu tribes of Rhodesia . . 535
Oracles of dead kings among the Barotsé 536
Evocation of the dead among the negroes of West Africa . . 537
Consultation of the dead by means of their images . . 537
Evocation of the dead among the Maoris 538
Evocation of the dead in Nukahiva 541
Evocation of the dead in New Guinea and Celebes . . . 542
Evocation of the dead in Borneo 542
Evocation of the dead among the Bataks of Sumatra . . . 545
Evocation of the dead among the Eskimo 546
Necromancy and evocation of the dead in China 546
Evocation of the dead among the Mordvins 551
Wide diffusion of necromancy 554

CHAPTER IX

THE SIN OF A CENSUS

Aversion of Jehovah to the numbering of Israel 555
Aversion of Congo peoples to count themselves or their children . 556
Aversion of East African tribes to count themselves or their cattle 556
Aversion of the Hottentots to be counted 558
Aversion to numbering people and things in North Africa . . 558
Mode of counting measures of grain in Palestine 559
Aversion to counting leaves in the Shortlands 559
Aversion to counting fruit or people among American Indians . . 559
Superstitious objection to counting in Europe 560
Jewish objection to a census probably superstitious . . . 563
Later relaxation of the rule 563

CHAPTER X

SOLOMON AND THE QUEEN OF SHEBA

Riddles propounded to Solomon by the Queen of Sheba . . . 564
Contest of wit between Solomon and Hiram 566

PAGE
Contests of wit between two Rajahs of Celebes 566
Solomon, the Queen of Sheba, and the crystal floor . . . 567
King Duryodhana and the crystal floor in the *Mahabharata* . . 568

CHAPTER XI

THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON

Solomon's test of motherhood 570
Repetition of the story in Jain literature 570

PART II

THE PATRIARCHAL AGE

(CONTINUED)

CHAPTER III

JACOB AND THE KIDSKINS OR THE NEW BIRTH

§ 1. *The Diverted Blessing*

The story of the subterfuge employed by Jacob to deprive Esau of their father's blessing may embody a reminiscence of a legal ceremony observed for the purpose of substituting a younger for an elder brother.

IN the last chapter we found some reason to think that as a younger son Jacob had, in virtue of an ancient custom, a prior claim to the inheritance of his father Isaac, and that the shifts to which he is said to have resorted for the purpose of depriving his elder brother Esau of his birthright were no more than attempts on the part of the historian to explain that succession of a younger in preference to an elder son which in his own day had long been obsolete and almost incomprehensible. In the light of this conclusion I propose in the present chapter to consider the ruse which Jacob, acting in collusion with his mother Rebekah, is reported to have practised on his father Isaac in order to divert the paternal blessing from his elder brother to himself. I conjecture that this story embodies a reminiscence of an ancient ceremony which in later times, when primogeniture had generally displaced ultimogeniture, was occasionally observed for the purpose of substituting a younger for an elder son as heir to his father. When once primogeniture or the succession of the firstborn had become firmly established as the rule of inheritance, any departure from it would be regarded as a breach of traditional custom that could only be sanctioned by the observance of some extraordinary formality designed either to invert the order of birth between the sons or to protect the younger son against certain dangers to which he might conceivably be exposed through the act of ousting his elder brother from the heritage. We need not suppose that such a formality was actually observed

by Jacob for the purpose of serving himself heir to his father; for if the custom of ultimogeniture was still in full vogue in his day, he was the legal heir, and no special ceremony was needed to invest him with those rights to which he was entitled in virtue of his birth. But at a later time, when ultimogeniture had been replaced by primogeniture, Jacob's biographer may have deemed it necessary to justify the traditionary succession of his hero to the estate by attributing to him the observance of a ceremony which, in the historian's day, was occasionally resorted to for the sake of giving a legal sanction to the preference of a younger son. At a still later time the editor of the biography, to whom the ceremony in question was unfamiliar, may have overlooked its legal significance, and represented it as merely a cunning subterfuge employed by Jacob at the instigation of his mother to cheat his elder brother out of the blessing which was his due. It is in this last stage of misunderstanding and misrepresentation that, on the present hypothesis, the narrative in Genesis has come down to us. It runs as follows:—[1]

The Biblical narrative. How Isaac purposed to bless his elder son Esau.

"And it came to pass, that when Isaac was old, and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see, he called Esau his elder son, and said unto him, My son: and he said unto him, Here am I. And he said, Behold now, I am old, I know not the day of my death. Now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me venison; and make me savoury meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die. And Rebekah heard when Isaac spake to Esau his son. And Esau went to the field to hunt for venison, and to bring it. And Rebekah spake unto Jacob her son, saying, Behold, I heard thy father speak unto Esau thy brother, saying, Bring me venison, and make me savoury meat, that I may eat, and bless thee before the Lord before my death. Now, therefore, my son, obey my voice according to that which I command thee. Go now to the flock, and fetch me from thence two good kids of the goats; and I will make them savoury meat for thy father, such as he loveth: and thou shalt bring

[1] Genesis xxvii. 1-29.

it to thy father, that he may eat, so that he may bless thee before his death. And Jacob said to Rebekah his mother, Behold Esau my brother is a hairy man, and I am a smooth man. My father peradventure will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a deceiver; and I shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing. And his mother said unto him, Upon me be thy curse, my son: only obey my voice, and go fetch me them. And he went, and fetched, and brought them to his mother: and his mother made savoury meat, such as his father loved. And Rebekah took the goodly raiment of Esau her elder son, which were with her in the house, and put them upon Jacob her younger son: and she put the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck: and she gave the savoury meat and the bread, which she had prepared, into the hand of her son Jacob. And he came unto his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I: who art thou, my son? And Jacob said unto his father, I am Esau thy firstborn: I have done according as thou badest me: arise, I pray thee, sit and eat of my venison, that thy soul may bless me. And Isaac said unto his son, How is it that thou hast found it so quickly, my son? And he said, Because the Lord thy God sent me good speed. And Isaac said unto Jacob, Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou be my very son Esau or not. And Jacob went near unto Isaac his father; and he felt him, and said, The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau. And he discerned him not, because his hands were hairy, as his brother Esau's hands: so he blessed him. And he said, Art thou my very son Esau? And he said, I am. And he said, Bring it near to me, and I will eat of my son's venison, that my soul may bless thee. And he brought it near to him, and he did eat: and he brought him wine, and he drank. And his father Isaac said unto him, Come near now, and kiss me, my son. And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled the smell of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed: and God give thee of the dew of heaven, and of the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: let peoples serve, and nations bow

How the younger son Jacob, instigated by his mother Rebekah, disguised himself in the likeness of Esau and received the paternal blessing which was intended for his elder brother.

down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be every one that blesseth thee."

The displacement of an elder by a younger son, and the means by which it was effected.

The points in this narrative to which I would call attention are first, the displacement of the elder by the younger son, and, second, the means by which the displacement was effected. The younger son pretended to be his elder brother by dressing in his elder brother's clothes and by wearing kidskins on his hands and neck for the purpose of imitating the hairiness of his elder brother's skin; and to this pretence he was instigated by his mother, who actively assisted him in the make-believe by putting his elder brother's garments on his body and the kidskins on his hands and neck. In this way Jacob, the younger son, succeeded in diverting to himself the paternal blessing which was intended for his elder brother, and thus he served himself heir to his father. It seems possible that in this story there may be preserved the reminiscence of a legal ceremony whereby a younger son was substituted for his elder brother as rightful heir to the paternal inheritance.

§ 2. *Sacrificial Skins in Ritual*

Tribes in East Africa whose customs resemble in some points those of the Semites.

In Eastern Africa there is a group of tribes, whose customs present some curious points of resemblance to those of Semitic peoples, and may help to illustrate and explain them; for in the slow course of social evolution these African tribes have lagged far behind the Semitic nations, and have accordingly preserved, crisp and clear, the stamp of certain primitive usages which elsewhere has been more or less effaced and worn down by the march of civilization. The tribes in question occupy what is called the eastern horn of Africa, roughly speaking from Abyssinia and the Gulf of Aden on the north to Mount Kilimanjaro and Lake Victoria Nyanza on the south. They belong neither to the pure negro stock, which is confined to Western Africa, nor to the pure Bantu stock, which, broadly speaking, occupies the whole of Southern Africa from the equator to the Cape of Good Hope. It is true that among them are tribes, such as the Akamba and Akikuyu, who speak Bantu

languages and perhaps belong in the main to the Bantu family; but even in regard to them it may be doubted how far they are true Bantus, and how far they have been transformed by admixture or contact with tribes of an alien race.[1] On the whole the dominant race in this part of Africa is the one to which modern ethnologists give the name of Ethiopian, and of which the Gallas are probably the purest type.[2] Their farthest outpost to the west appears to be formed by the pastoral Bahima of Ankole, in the Uganda Protectorate, to whom the royal families of Uganda, Unyoro, and Karagwe are believed to be allied.[3] Among the other tribes of this family the best-known perhaps are the kindred Masai and Nandi, as to whom we are fortunate enough to possess two excellent monographs by an English ethnologist, Mr. A. C. Hollis.[4] On the affinity of these tribes to the Gallas he tells us: "I do not consider that the part which the Galla have played in building up the Masai, Nandi-Lumbwa, and other races, such as perhaps the

[1] "In dealing with the Akikuyu people it is as yet impossible to speak definitely on the subject of race. On this matter, as on that of their more recent origin and history, much yet remains to be learnt. They speak undoubtedly a Bantu language, but Mr. McGregor informs me that they possess another language in addition to that in common use" (W. Scoresby Routledge and Katherine Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, the Akikuyu of British East Africa*, London, 1910, p. 19). The Akikuyu say that their nation is derived from the Akamba, and in the opinion of Mr. and Mrs. Routledge the statement is probably correct, "as an examination of the two languages will show, although certain evidence points to the fission as being remote; the Akamba are to-day their neighbours to the south-east" (*op. cit.* pp. 2 *sq.*). If this view of the derivation of the Akikuyu from the Akamba is well founded, it will follow that the same doubt as to the ethnical affinity of the Akikuyu will apply to the Akamba, though according to Mr. C. W. Hobley, "the A-Kamba are probably the purest Bantu race in British East Africa" (*Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 2). According to the Hon. K. R. Dundas, the present Akikuyu have been formed by the fusion of many different tribes, as appears from the numerous physical types which are to be seen among them, and which a practised eye can readily distinguish. Among these types he mentions the Masai, the Kamba, and the Dorobo. See Hon. K. R. Dundas, "Notes on the Origin and History of the Kikuyu and Dorobo tribes," *Man*, viii. (1908) pp. 136 *sqq*. See also Sir Charles Eliot, in M. W. H. Beech, *The Suk* (Oxford, 1911), p. xi.

[2] J. Deniker, *The Races of Man* (London, 1900), pp. 436 *sqq*.

[3] J. H. Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile* (London, 1912), ch. ix. pp. 201 *sqq*., 421, 430; Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, Second Edition (London, 1904), ii. 484 *sqq*., 600 *sqq*.; John Roscoe, *The Baganda* (London, 1911), pp. 186 *sq*.

[4] *The Masai, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1905); *The Nandi, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1909).

Bahima of Uganda, has been sufficiently realized or taken into account in the past. The influence of their Galla ancestors is frequently shown in the personal appearance, religion, customs, and, in a lesser degree, in the languages of many of these tribes."[1] Now the home of the Gallas in Africa is separated only by a narrow sea from Arabia, the cradle of the Semitic race, and intercourse between the two countries and the two peoples must have been frequent from a remote antiquity. Hence it is not so surprising as might at first appear, if we should find resemblances between Semitic and Ethiopian customs. The cry from Mount Zion to Kilimanjaro is indeed far, but it may have been passed on through intermediate stations along the coasts of Arabia and Africa. In saying this I do not wish to imply any opinion as to the question whether similarities of Semitic and Ethiopian usage are to be explained by derivation from a common source or by the influence of similar circumstances acting independently on the minds of different races. I only indicate the hypothesis of a common origin as an alternative which should not be lightly rejected.[2]

Having said so much to guard myself against the suspicion of fetching my comparisons from an unreasonable distance, I will now adduce some of the facts which suggest that an ancient legal formality underlies the story of the deceit practised by Jacob on his father.

Use of sacrificial fat and skin at the Galla ceremony of adoption.

Among the Gallas it is customary for childless couples to adopt children; and so close is the tie formed by adoption that even if the couple should afterwards have offspring of their own, the adopted child retains all the rights of the

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 1 note [2]. Mr. C. W. Hobley inclines to regard the Nandi as a blend of the Nilotic and Hamitic stocks (*Eastern Uganda*, London, 1902, p. 10). Sir Harry Johnston finds in the Masai language "distinct though distant signs of relationship" to the Galla. See his article, "The people of Eastern Equatorial Africa," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xv. (1886) p. 15.

[2] Some respectable authorities are of opinion that this group of African tribes is either of Arabian origin or has at all events been modified by intermarriage with immigrants from Arabia. See J. H. Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile* (London, 1912), ch. viii. pp. 201 *sqq.*; J. Deniker, *The Races of Man*, p. 429. The Galla language, though it is not Semitic, is said to present points of resemblance to the Semitic family of speech in respect of conjugation, pronouns, numerals, and so forth. See Ernest Renan, *Histoire Générale et Système comparé des Langues Sémitiques*[5] (Paris, 1878), pp. 91 *sq.*, 338 *sqq.*

firstborn. In order to transfer a child from its real to its adoptive parents, the following ceremony is performed. The child, who is commonly about three years old, is taken from its mother and led or carried away into a wood. There the father formally relinquishes all claim to it, by declaring that thenceforth the child is dead to him. Then an ox is killed, its blood is smeared on the child's forehead, a portion of its fat is put round the child's neck, and with a portion of its skin the child's hands are covered.[1] The resemblance of this ceremony to Jacob's subterfuge is obvious: in both cases the hands and neck of the person concerned are covered with the skin or fat of a slain animal. But the meaning of the ceremony is not yet apparent. Perhaps we may discover it by examining some similar rites observed on various occasions by tribes of East Africa.

Ceremonial use of rings made from the skins of sacrificial victims in East Africa.

Among these tribes it is a common practice to sacrifice an animal, usually a goat or a sheep, skin it, cut the skin into strips, and place the strips round the wrists or on the fingers of persons who are supposed in one way or other to benefit thereby; it may be that they are rid of sickness or rendered immune against it, or that they are purified from ceremonial pollution, or that they are invested with mysterious powers.[2] Thus, among the Akamba, when a child is born, a goat is killed and skinned, three strips are cut from the skin, and placed on the wrists of the child, the mother, and the father respectively.[3] Among the Akikuyu, on a like occasion, a sheep is slaughtered, and a strip of skin, taken from one of its fore-feet, is fastened as a bracelet on the infant's wrist, to remove the ill-luck or ceremonial pollution (*thahu*) which is supposed to attach to new-born children.[4]

Kikuyu ceremony of the new birth.

Again, a similar custom is observed by the Akikuyu at the curious rite of "being born again" (*ko-chi-a-rú-o ke-ri*) or "born of a goat" (*ko-chi-a-re-i-rú-o m'bór-i*), as the natives call it, which every Kikuyu child had formerly to undergo

[1] Ph. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas, die materielle Cultur der Danâkil, Galla und Somâl* (Berlin, 1893), pp. 193 *sq.*; *id.*, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Anthropologie der Somâl, Galla und Hararî* (Leipsic, 1886), pp. 54 *sq.*

[2] Compare Hon. Ch. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 528.

[3] Hon. Ch. Dundas, *op. cit.* p. 546.

[4] C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 431.

before circumcision. The age at which the ceremony is performed varies with the ability of the father to provide the goat or sheep which is required for the due observance of the rite; but it seems that the new birth generally takes place when a child is about ten years or younger. If the child's father or mother is dead, a man or woman acts as proxy on the occasion, and in such a case the woman is thenceforth regarded by the child as its own mother. A goat or sheep is killed in the afternoon and the stomach and intestines are reserved. The ceremony takes place at evening in a hut; none but women are allowed to be present. A circular piece of the goat-skin or sheep-skin is passed over one shoulder and under the other arm of the child who is to be born again; and the animal's stomach is similarly passed over the child's other shoulder and under its other arm. The mother, or the woman who acts as mother, sits on a hide on the floor with the child between her knees. The goat's or sheep's gut is passed round her and brought in front of the child. She groans as if in labour, another woman cuts the gut as if it were the navel-string, and the child imitates the cry of a new-born infant. Until a lad has thus been born again in mimicry, he may not assist at the disposal of his father's body after death, nor help to carry him out into the wilds to die. Formerly the ceremony of the new birth was combined with the ceremony of circumcision; but the two are now kept separate.[1]

Meaning of the Kikuyu ceremony of the new birth.

Such is the curious custom of the new birth, as it is, or used to be, practised by the Akikuyu, and as it was described to Mr. and Mrs. Routledge by natives who had freed themselves from tradition and come under the influence of Christianity. Yet great reluctance was shown to speak about the subject, and neither persuasion nor bribery availed to procure leave for the English inquirers to witness the ceremony. Yet its general meaning seems plain enough, and indeed is sufficiently declared in the alternative title which the Akikuyu give to the rite, namely, "to be born of a goat." The ceremony, in fact, consists essentially of a pretence that the mother is a she-goat and that she has

[1] W. Scoresby Routledge and Katherine Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, the Akikuyu of British East Africa* (London, 1910), pp. 151-153.

given birth to a kid. This explains why the child is enveloped in the stomach and skin of a goat, and why the goat's guts are passed round both mother and child. So far as the mother is concerned, this assimilation to an animal comes out perhaps more clearly in an independent account which Mr. C. W. Hobley has given of the ceremony; though in his description the animal which the mother mimics is a sheep and not a goat. The name of the ceremony, he tells us, is *Ku-chiaruo ringi*, the literal translation of which is "to be born again." He further informs us that the Akikuyu are divided into two guilds, the Kikuyu and the Masai, and that the ceremony of being born again differs somewhat as it is observed by the two guilds respectively. When the parents of the child belong to the Masai guild, the rite is celebrated as follows. "About eight days after the birth of the child, be it male or female, the father of the infant kills a male sheep and takes the meat to the house of the mother, who eats it assisted by her neighbours as long as they belong to the Masai guild. At the conclusion of the feast the mother is adorned with the skin from the left fore-leg and shoulder of the sheep, the piece of skin being fastened from her left wrist to left shoulder; she wears this for four days, and it is then taken off and thrown on to her bed and stays there till it disappears. The mother and child have their heads shaved on the day this ceremony takes place; it has no connection with the naming of the child which is done on the day of its birth."[1] Here the intention seems to be to assimilate the mother to a sheep; this is done by giving her sheep's flesh to eat and investing her with the skin of the animal, which is left lying on the bed where, eight days before, she gave birth to the child. For it is to be observed that in this form of the ritual the simulation of the new birth follows the real birth at an interval of only a few days.

Another account of the ceremony.

But if the parents belong to the Kikuyu guild, the ritual of the new birth is as follows in the south of the Kikuyu country. "The day after the birth a male sheep is killed and some of the fat of the sheep is cooked in a pot and given to the mother and infant to drink. It was not specific-

Another form of the ceremony of the new birth among the Akikuyu.

[1] C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 440 *sq.*

ally stated that this had a direct connection with the rite referred to, but the description commenced with a mention of this. When the child reaches the age of from three to six years the father kills a male sheep, and three days later the novice is adorned with part of the skin and the skin of the big stomach. These skins are fastened on the right shoulder of a boy or on the left shoulder of a girl. The skin used for a boy has, however, the left shoulder and leg cut out of it, and that for a girl has the right shoulder and leg cut away. The child wears these for three days, and on the fourth day the father cohabits with the mother of the child. There is, however, one important point, and that is that before the child is decorated with the sheep-skin it has to go and lie alongside its mother on her bed and cry out like a newly born infant. Only after this ceremony has been performed is the child eligible for circumcision. A few days after circumcision the child returns to sleep on a bed in its mother's hut, but the father has to kill a sheep before he can return, and the child has to drink some of the blood, the father also has to cohabit with the mother upon the occasion." [1]

Assimilation of mother and child to sheep and lamb.

In this form of the ritual, as in the one described by Mr. and Mrs. Routledge, the ceremony of the new birth is deferred until several years after the real birth. But the essence of the rite appears to be the same: it is a pretence that the mother is a sheep, and that she has given birth to a lamb. However, we must note the inconsistency of using, for the purpose of this legal fiction, a ram instead of a ewe.

Kikuyu ceremony of adoption.

Having described the ceremony of the new birth in the two forms in which it is observed by the two guilds of the Akikuyu, Mr. Hobley proceeds to describe another Kikuyu ceremony, which is similar in form to the rite of the new birth and is designated by a similar, though not identical, name (*Ku-chiaruo kungi* instead of *Ku-chiaruo ringi*). It is a ceremony of adoption and is said to resemble the Swahili rite called *ndugu Kuchanjiana*. "If a person has no brothers or parents he will probably try to obtain the protection of some wealthy man and his family. If such a man agrees to

[1] C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 441.

adopt him, he will take a male sheep and slaughter it, and the suppliant takes another one. The elders are assembled and slaughter these sheep, and strips of the skin (*rukwaru*) from the right foot and from the chest of each sheep are tied round each person's hand, each is decorated with strips of skin from the sheep of the other party. The poor man is then considered as the son of the wealthy one, and when the occasion arises the latter pays out live stock to buy a wife for his adopted son."[1] In this ceremony there can hardly be any pretence of a new birth, since both the performers are males; but on the analogy of the preceding customs it seems fair to suppose that the two parties, the adopting father and the adopted son, pretend to be sheep.

Ceremonies observed at circumcision by the Akikuyu, Washamba, Wachaga, and Bworana Gallas.

Further, a similar ritual is observed before the Kikuyu ceremony of circumcision. On the morning of the day which precedes the rite of circumcision, a he-goat is killed by being strangled; it is then skinned, and the skin having been cut into strips, a strip of the skin is fastened round the right wrist and carried over the back of the hand of each male candidate, after which the second finger of the candidate's hand is inserted through a slit in the strip of skin.[2] A similar custom is observed by the Washamba, another tribe of East Africa. Before the rite of circumcision is performed, they sacrifice a goat to an ancestral spirit, and cut wristlets from its skin for the boys who are to be circumcised, as well as for their parents and kinsfolk. In sacrificing the goat the father of the boy prays to the ancestor, saying, "We are come to tell thee that our son is to be circumcised to-day. Guard the child and be gracious, be not wrathful! We bring thee a goat."[3] Here, by binding strips of the skin on their own bodies, the members of the family seem to identify themselves with the goat which they offer to the ancestral ghost. Among the Wachaga of Mount Kilimanjaro, about two months after circumcision the lads assemble at the chief's village, where the sorcerers or medicine-men are also gathered together. Goats are killed and the newly circumcised lads cut thongs

[1] C. W. Hobley, *op. cit.* pp. 441 *sq.*

[2] C. W. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 442.

[3] A. Karasek, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Waschamba," *Baessler-Archiv*, i. (1911) p. 191.

from the hides and insert the middle fingers of their right hands through slits in the thongs. Meantime the sorcerers compound a medicine out of the contents of the stomachs of the goats, mixed with water and magical stuffs. This mixture the chief sprinkles on the lads, perhaps to complete the magical or sacramental identification of the lads with the animal. Next day the father of each lad makes a feast for his relations. A goat is killed, and every guest gets a piece of the goat's skin, which he puts round the middle finger of his right hand.[1] We may compare a ceremony observed among the Bworana Gallas when lads attain their majority. The ceremony is called *ada* or forehead, but this is explained by a word *jara*, which means circumcision. On these occasions the young men, on whose behalf the rite is celebrated, assemble with their parents and elder relatives in a hut built for the purpose. A bullock is there sacrificed, and every person present dips a finger into the blood, which is allowed to flow over the ground; the men dab the blood on their foreheads, and the women on their windpipes. Further, the women smear themselves with fat taken from the sacrificial victim, and wear narrow strips of its hide round their necks till the next day. The flesh of the bullock furnishes a banquet.[2]

Ceremonial use of sacrificial skins at marriage in East Africa.

A similar use of sacrificial skins is made at marriage in some of these African tribes. Thus among the Wawanga of the Elgon District, in British East Africa, a part of the marriage ceremony is this. A he-goat is killed, and a long strip of skin is cut from its belly. The bridegroom's father, or some other elderly male relative, then slits the skin up lengthwise and passes it over the bride's head, so that it hangs down over her chest, while he says, "Now I have put this skin over your head; if you leave us for any other man, may this skin repudiate you, and may you become barren."[3] Again, among the Theraka, a tribe who live on both sides

[1] M. Merker, *Rechtsverhältnisse und Sitten der Wadschagga* (Gotha, 1902), pp. 14 *sq.* (*Petermanns Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsheft*, No. 138).

[2] E. G. Ravenstein, "Somal and Galla land; embodying information collected by the Rev. Thomas Wakefield," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S. vi. (1884) p. 271.

[3] Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 39.

of the Tana River in British East Africa and closely resemble the Akikuyu in appearance and language, when a husband brings his bride to his village, he kills a goat and carries it before the girl into the hut; according to others, the goat is laid before the door of the hut and the girl must jump over it. A strip of the goat's skin is then put on the bride's wrist.[1] Again, among the Wa-giriama, a Bantu tribe of British East Africa, on the day after marriage the husband kills a goat, and cutting off a piece of skin from its forehead makes it into an amulet and gives it to his wife, who wears it on her left arm. The flesh of the goat is eaten by the persons present.[2] In these cases the goat's skin is applied only to the bride, but among the Nandi of British East Africa it is applied to the bridegroom also. On the marriage day a goat, specially selected as a strong, healthy animal from the flock, is anointed and then killed by being strangled. Its entrails are extracted and omens drawn from their condition. Afterwards the animal is skinned, and while the women roast and eat the meat, the skin is rapidly dressed and given to the bride to wear. Moreover, a ring and a bracelet are made out of the skin; the ring is put on the middle finger of the bridegroom's right hand, and the bracelet is put on the bride's left wrist.[3]

Ceremonial use of sacrificial skins at covenants in East Africa.

Again, rings made from the skin of a sacrificed goat are placed on the fingers of persons who form a covenant of friendship with each other. The custom appears to be common among the tribes of British East Africa. Thus, among the Wachaga "friendships are formed by the *Kiskong'o* ceremony, which consists in taking the skin from the head of a goat, making a slit in it, and putting it upon the middle finger in the form of a ring."[4] Similarly, among the Akamba, the exchange of rings made out of the skin of a sacrificial victim, which has been eaten in common, cements

[1] Hon. Charles Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 541 *sq.*, 546.

[2] Captain W. E. H. Barrett, "Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wa-giriama, etc., British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli. (1911) p. 21.

[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi* (Oxford, 1909), p. 63. Such rings are described by Mr. Hollis as amulets (*op. cit.* p. 87).

[4] Charles New, *Life, Wanderings and Labours in Eastern Africa* (London, 1873), p. 458.

the bond of friendship.[1] For example, when Baron von der Decken was in Dafeta, the chief or sultan Maungu formed a league of friendship by means of the following ceremony. A goat was brought and both parties spat on its forehead. The animal was next killed, the skin of its forehead removed, and cut into thin strips, each with a slit in it. The chief then put one of these strips of skin on the middle finger of the traveller's right hand, and the traveller did the same to the chief. Afterwards a piece of the flesh of the goat was roasted, each of the parties spat upon it, and then ate, or was supposed to eat, the portion upon which the other had spat. However, the Baron contrived to slip his morsel aside without being detected.[2] In this ceremony the union effected by wearing rings cut from the skin of the same goat is further cemented by partaking of the animal's flesh and by swallowing each other's spittle; for since the spittle is a portion of a man, an exchange of spittle is like an exchange of blood and forms a binding covenant, each party to the compact being thus put in possession of a physical part of the other, by means of which he can exercise a magical control over him and so hold him to the terms of agreement.[3] An English traveller has described how in like manner he made friendship with a chief or sultan of the Wachaga in East Africa. He says: "On the day after our arrival, a Swahili runaway came as a messenger of the chief to make friends and brothers with me. A goat was brought, and, taking it by one ear, I was required to state where I was going, to declare that I meant no evil, and did not work in *uchawi* (black magic), and finally, to promise that I would do no harm to the country. The other ear was then taken by the sultan's ambassador, and he made promise on his part that no harm would be done to us, that food would be given, and all articles stolen returned. The

[1] J. M. Hildebrandt, "Ethnographische Notizen über Wakámba und ihre Nachbarn," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x. (1878) p. 386.

[2] Baron Carl Claus von der Decken, *Reisen in Ost-Afrika* (Leipsic and Heidelberg, 1869–1871), i. 262 *sq.* Compare J. Raum, "Blut- und Speichelbünde bei den Wadschagga," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, x. (1907) pp. 274 *sq.*

[3] For examples, see J. Raum, "Blut- und Speichelbünde bei den Wadschagga," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, x. (1907) pp. 290 *sq.*; H. Trilles, *Le Totémisme chez les Fân* (Münster i. W. 1912), p. 462.

goat was then killed, and a strip of skin cut off the forehead, in which two slits were made. The M-swahili, taking hold of this, pushed it on my finger by the lower slit five times, finally pushing it over the joint. I had next to take the strip, still keeping it on my own finger, and do the same for the M-swahili, through the upper slit. This operation finished, the strip had to be cut in two, leaving the respective portions on our fingers, and the sultan of Shira and I were sworn brothers."[1]

Ceremonial use of sacrificial skins in another Kikuyu rite.

Among the Akikuyu a similar, but somewhat more elaborate, ceremony is observed when a man leaves his own district and formally joins another. He and the representative of the district to which he is about to attach himself each provide a sheep or, if they are well off, an ox. The animal is killed, "and from the belly of each a strip is cut, and also a piece of skin from a leg of each animal. Blood from each of the two animals is put into one leaf and the contents of the two bellies into another leaf. The elders (*ki-á-ma*) slit the two pieces of skin from the leg and the two strips from the belly, and make four wristlets; the two coming from the beast of one party are placed on the right arm of the other party, and *vice versa*. The elders then take the two leaves containing blood, and both parties to the transaction extend their hands; the elders pour a little blood into all the four palms, and this is passed from the palms of the one person to those of the other. All round are called to see that the blood is mingled, and hear the proclamation that the two are now of one blood."[2] This last example is instructive, since it shows clearly that the intention of the rite is to make the two contracting parties of one blood; hence we seem bound to explain on the same principle the custom of encircling their wrists with strips of skin taken from the same animals which furnished the blood for the ceremony.

Variation in the Wachaga rite at circumcision.

We have seen that the same custom of wearing wristlets made from the skin of a sacrificial victim is observed by the Wachaga of Mount Kilimanjaro when they sacrifice a goat

[1] Joseph Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (London, 1885), p. 158.

[2] W. Scoresby Routledge and Katherine Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, the Akikuyu of British East Africa* (London, 1910), pp. 176 *sq.*

to an ancestral spirit at circumcision. The ritual varies somewhat according as the spirit is an ancestor in the paternal or the maternal line. If he is a paternal ancestor, the strip of skin is worn on the middle finger of the right hand; if he is a maternal ancestor, it is worn on the middle finger of the left hand. If the sacrifice was offered to an undefined ancestor on the father's side, the strip is worn on the big toe of the right foot; if it was offered to an undefined ancestor on the mother's side, it is worn on the big toe of the left foot.[1]

Ceremonial use of victim's skin at sacrifices among the Wachaga.

In the same tribe, when a childless couple desire to obtain offspring, or a couple whose children have died one after the other wish to ensure the life of the rest, they sacrifice a goat to God (*Ruwa*) or to an ancestral spirit, with a peculiar ritual. All the married couples of the family assemble at the house of the afflicted couple; a goat is laid on its back at the entrance of the house, so that its body is half within the door and half without it; the husband spits four times between the horns of the animal, and afterwards he and his wife leap four times over its body. Then just at noon the goat is killed by an old woman, who stabs it with a knife. If the sacrifice is offered to an ancestral spirit, a prayer is addressed to him, begging him to behold the tears of his grandson and grant him a child, while the ghost is at the same time invited to accept the goat and eat it with his friends in his house. At the conclusion of the ceremony all the participants put rings on their fingers, which have been made out of the goat's skin. The ring is put on the husband's finger by the oldest male member of the family, who in doing so prays that the man's wife may give birth to a male child. Then the husband puts the ring on his wife's finger with a similar prayer.[2] Again, among the Wachaga, on the eighth day after a death, a goat is sacrificed to the ancestral spirits, and rings made from the skin of its head are given to all the surviving female relations to wear. This is believed to avert all evil consequences of the death.[3] Among the

[1] M. Merker, *Rechtsverhältnisse und Sitten der Wadschagga* (Gotha, 1902), p. 20 (*Petermanns Mitteilungen, Ergänzungsheft*, No. 138).

[2] Bruno Guttmann, "Feldbausitten der Wadschagga," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xlv. (1913) pp. 509 *sq.*

[3] B. Guttmann, "Trauer und Begräbnissitten der Wadschagga," *Globus*, lxxxix. (1906) p. 198.

Ceremonial use of victim's skin at sacrifices among the Wagogo, Nandi, Wawanga, and Njamus.

Wagogo, another tribe of East Africa, a different use is made of the victim's skin in sacrificing at the grave of a chief. The victim is a black ox or sheep; it is stifled, and its skin is cut in strips, which are laid round the grave,[1] no doubt to indicate the consecration of the animal to the ghost. But in sacrificing a black ox to God for rain they cut the hide into strips and every person present wears one of them on his arm.[2] When disease breaks out in a herd, the Nandi kindle a great bonfire and drive the cattle to it. A pregnant sheep is then brought and anointed with milk by an elder, who prays, "God! give us the belly which is good." Afterwards two men belonging to clans that may intermarry seize the sheep and strangle it. The intestines are inspected, and if the omens are good, the meat is roasted and eaten, whilst rings are made of the skin and worn by the cattle-owners.[3] Among the Wawanga of the Elgon District, in British East Africa, various sacrifices have to be offered before the people are allowed to sow their millet. Among the rest, a black ram is strangled before the hut of the king's mother, after which the carcass is taken into the hut and placed by the bedside facing towards the head of the bed. Next day it is taken out and cut up, and the king, his wives, and children, tie strips of its skin round their fingers.[4] The Njamus, a mixed people of British East Africa, water their plantations by means of ditches cut in the dry season. When the time is come to irrigate the land by opening the dam and allowing the water to flow into the fields, they kill a sheep of a particular colour by smothering it, and then sprinkle its melted fat, dung, and blood at the mouth of the furrow and in the water. Then the dam is opened, and the flesh of the sacrificed sheep is eaten. For two days afterwards the man who performed the sacrifice, and who must belong to one particular clan (the Il Mayek), has to wear the skin of the sheep bound about his head. Later in the season, if the crops are not doing well, recourse is again had to sacrifice. Two elders of the same officiating clan, who may be compared to the Levites of Israel, repair

[1] H. Claus, *Die Wagogo* (Leipsic and Berlin, 1911), p. 49.

[2] H. Claus, *Die Wagogo*, p. 42.

[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi* (Oxford, 1909), pp. 45 *sq.*

[4] Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 48.

to the plantations along with two elders from any other clan. They take with them a sheep of the same colour as before; and having killed and eaten it, they cut up the skin, and each man binds a strip of it round his head, which he must wear for two days. Then separating, they walk in opposite directions round the plantation, sprinkling fat, honey, and dung on the ground, until they meet on the other side.[1]

Ceremonial use of victim's skin at sacrifices among the Masai.

The Masai sacrifice to God for the health of man and beast at frequent intervals, in some places almost every month. A great fire is kindled in the kraal with dry wood, and fed with certain leaves, bark, and powder, which yield a fragrant smell and send up a high column of thick smoke. God smells the sweet scent in heaven and is well pleased. Then a large black ram is brought forward, washed with honey beer, and sprinkled with the powder of a certain wood. Next the animal is killed by being stifled; afterwards it is skinned and the flesh cut up. Every person present receives a morsel of the flesh, which he roasts in the ashes and eats. Also he is given a strip of the skin, which he makes into rings, one for himself and the others for the members of his family. These rings are regarded as amulets which protect the wearers from sickness of every kind. Men wear them on the middle finger of the right hand; women wear them fastened to the great spiral-shaped necklaces of iron wire by which they adorn, or disfigure, their necks.[2]

Ceremonial use of sacrificial victim's skin in cases of sickness and on other occasions among the Wawanga.

Again, similar sacrificial customs are observed in cases of sickness. For example, among the Wawanga it sometimes happens that a sick man in a state of delirium calls out the name of a departed relative. When he does so, the sickness is at once set down at the door of the ghost, and steps are taken to deal effectually with him. A poor old man is bribed to engage in the dangerous task of digging up the corpse, after which the bones are burnt over a nest of red ants, and the ashes swept into a basket and thrown into a river. Sometimes the mode of giving his quietus to the ghost is slightly different. Instead of digging up his bones, his relatives drive a stake into the head of the

[1] Hon. K. R. Dundas, "Notes on the Tribes inhabiting the Baringo District, East Africa Protectorate," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 54 *sq.*

[2] M. Merker, *Die Masai* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 200 *sq.*

grave, and, to make assurance doubly sure, pour boiling water down after it. Having thus disposed of the ghost in a satisfactory manner, they kill a black ram, rub dung from the stomach of the animal on their chests, and tie strips of its skin round their right wrists. Further, the head of the family, in which the sickness occurred, binds a strip of the skin round the second finger of his right hand, and the sick man himself fastens a strip round his neck.[1] In this case we cannot regard the sacrifice of the black ram as intended to soothe and propitiate the ghost who had just had a stake thrust through his head and boiling water poured on his bones. Rather we must suppose that the sacrifice is due to a lingering suspicion that even these strong measures may not be wholly effectual in disarming him; so to be on the safe side the sick man and his friends fortify themselves against ghostly assaults by the skin of a sacrificial victim, which serves them as an amulet. Again, among these same people a man accused of theft will sometimes go with his accuser to a tree of a particular kind (*Erythrina tomentosa*) and the two will thrust their spears into it. After that the guilty party, whether the thief or his wrongful accuser, falls sick. The cause of the sickness is not alleged, but we may suppose that it is the wrath of the tree-spirit, who naturally resents being jabbed with spears and, with a discrimination which does him credit, vents his anguish on the criminal only. So the bad man sickens, and nothing can cure him but to dig up the tree, root and branch; for that, we may suppose, is the only way of settling accounts with the tree-spirit. Accordingly the friends of the sufferer repair to the tree and root it up; at the same time they sacrifice a sheep and eat it on the spot, with some medicinal concoction. After that every one ties a strip of the sheep's skin round his right wrist; and the sick man, for whose benefit the ceremony is performed, binds a strip of the skin round his neck, and rubs some of the dung of the slaughtered beast on his chest.[2]

[1] Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 38.

[2] Hon. K. R. Dundas, *op. cit.* p. 43. Sometimes, instead of the *Erythrina tomentosa*, a tree of a different kind, called by the natives *murumba* (the bark-cloth tree of Uganda), is used for this purpose.

Here again the sacrifice of the sheep can hardly be regarded as propitiatory; rather it is designed to protect the patient and his friends against the natural indignation of the tree-spirit, in case they should not have succeeded in radically destroying him. Once more, the Wawanga are acquainted with a form of witchcraft which consists in burying a dead rat at the door of a hut. This causes the inmates to fall sick, and they may even die, if the proper remedy is not resorted to, which is to kill a red or a white cock and pour its blood on the spot where the rat was found. However, if they venture to apply this remedy without consulting a licensed practitioner, that is, a witch-doctor, they will again fall sick and will not recover till they have called in the man of skill, who kills a sheep, ties a piece of the skin round each person's hand, and rubs dung on their chests. The whole of the mutton, except one shoulder, is given to the doctor as his fee.[1] Here again the intention of the sacrifice is clearly protective, not propitiatory. Some years ago the Akikuyu rejoiced in the possession of a prophet, who was favoured with revelations from the Supreme Being. In April 1911 he predicted that the young people would suffer greatly from dysentery in the course of the year, and to guard against the danger he recommended that sheep should be sacrificed at the sacred fig trees, and that the women and children should put bracelets from the skins of the sacrificed sheep on their wrists. Many did so in the confident hope of escaping the visitation.[2]

Use of skins of sacrificial victims as a preventive of sickness among the Akikuyu.

Further, the custom of wearing portions of the skins of sacrificial victims is commonly observed among these East African tribes at expiatory ceremonies. For example, among the Wachaga, if a husband has beaten his wife and she comes back to him, he cuts off a goat's ear and makes rings out of it, which they put on each other's fingers. Till he has done this, she may neither cook for him nor eat with him.[3] Further, like many other African tribes, the Wachaga

Ceremonial use of skins of sacrificial victims at expiations among the Wachaga.

[1] Hon. K. R. Dundas, *op. cit.* p. 44.

[2] C. W. Hobley, "Further researches into Kikuyu and Kamba religious beliefs and customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli. (1911) pp. 437-439.

[3] J. Raum, "Die Religion der Landschaft Moschi am Kilimandjaro," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xiv. (1911) p. 189.

look upon a smith with superstitious awe as a being invested with mysterious powers, which elevate him above the level of common men. This atmosphere of wonder and mystery extends also to the instruments of his craft, and particularly to his hammer, which is supposed to be endowed with magical or spiritual virtue. Hence he must be very careful how he handles the hammer in presence of other people, lest he should endanger their lives by its miraculous influence. For example, if he merely points at a man with the hammer, they believe that the man will die, unless a solemn ceremony is performed to expiate the injury. Hence a goat is killed, and two rings are made out of its skin. One of the rings is put on the middle finger of the smith's right hand, the other is put on the corresponding finger of the man whose life he has jeopardized, and expiatory formulas are recited. A similar atonement must be made if the smith has pointed at any one with the tongs, or has chanced to hit any one with the slag of his iron. Again, when he is hammering a piece of iron for somebody, and the head of the hammer flies off, the smith says to the owner of the iron, who commonly sits by watching the operation, "The chief wants you. I must keep your iron and cannot work it until you have given him satisfaction." So the owner of the iron must bring a goat, and they kill the animal and eat its flesh together. Next they cut rings out of the skin of the goat's head and place the rings on each other's fingers with mutual good wishes and blessings. Moreover, another ring, made out of the goat's skin, is put on the handle of the hammer; and with the hammer thus decorated, or rather guarded against the powers of evil, the smith resumes and completes his task of hammering the iron into the desired shape.[1]

[1] B. Gutmann, "Der Schmied und seine Kunst im animistischen Denken," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xliv. (1912) pp. 82-84. As to the superstitions attaching to smiths and smithcraft in Africa and elsewhere, see Richard Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche* (Stuttgart, 1878), pp. 153-164; Günter Tessmann, *Die Pangwe* (Berlin, 1913), i. 224-226; John H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo* (London, 1914), pp. 93, 240, 249; C. G. Seligmann, "A note on the magico-religious aspect of iron working in Southern Kordofan," *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology, issued by the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology*, vi. (1914) pp. 119 *sq.*; and the authorities referred to in *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, p. 236 note[6] (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part ii.).

Further ceremonial use of skins of sacrificial victims at expiations among the Wachaga.

Again, among the Wachaga on the eastern side of Mount Kilimanjaro, it is a custom that a newly married woman may not drink the milk of a cow belonging to her husband which has just calved, unless she makes the following expiation. Her husband kills a goat or an ox and cuts off one of the fore-legs together with the breast. These pieces are put on the young wife's head and she is sent away to her own people, with the words, "Go home (to your mother's people). Do not quarrel with your husband. May your cows give plenty of milk, may your goats cast good kids, may your beans not be eaten by mice, nor your corn by birds. When you go to market, may you be well received and find a chance of cheating. But be careful not to cheat so as to be found out and be taken to law." With these good wishes the young wife is sent away to her parents, who receive her solemnly, take the flesh from her head, and lay it on the ground. Then they take the leg of the goat or ox and cut out of the skin a ring large enough to be pushed over the woman's left hand. There they fasten it, and then push four small morsels of flesh between the ring and her hand. These pieces she must eat, a fifth piece, which they afterwards push through, she allows to fall on the ground. Finally her mother's people utter good wishes like those which her husband's people uttered when they sent her with the goat's flesh and skin to her old home. That ends the ceremony, and after it is over, the young wife is free to drink the milk of the cow at her husband's house.[1] The exact meaning of this ceremony in all its details is no longer understood even by the natives themselves, and we can hardly hope to divine it; but the general intention appears to be to expiate the breach of a taboo which forbade a young wife to partake of the milk of a cow that had just calved on her husband's farm. As we shall see later on, the drinking of milk among these East African tribes is hedged round by many curious restrictions, the object of which is to guard, not the drinker of the milk, but the cow, against certain evil consequences believed to flow from contact of the fluid with tabooed persons or things. In the

[1] Bruno Guttmann, "Feldbausitten der Wadschagga," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xlv. (1913) pp. 507 *sq.*

present case we may conjecture that if the young wife were to drink of the cow's milk without first performing the ceremony of expiation, she would be supposed thereby to endanger the cow's milk and perhaps even its life.

Ceremonial use of skins of sacrificial victims at expiations among the Akikuyu.

Expiatory ceremonies involving the use of the skin of a sacrificial victim are performed by the Akikuyu on a variety of occasions. For example, if two men, who have been circumcised at the same time, fight each other and blood is spilt, ceremonial pollution is incurred, and a medicine-man must be called in to remove it. He kills a sheep, and the elders put a strip of its skin on the wrist of each of the two men. This removes the pollution and reconciles the adversaries.[1] Again, among the Akikuyu, the wives of smiths usually wear armlets of twisted iron. If a man enters the hut of a smith and cohabits with a woman so decorated, a state of ceremonial pollution is incurred, which can only be expiated by another smith, who kills a sheep, and, cutting strips from its skin, puts them on the wrists of the man, his wife, and any children she may have. The bracelet is placed on the left wrist of a woman, on the right wrist of a man.[2] Again, in the same tribe, if the side pole of a bedstead breaks, the person lying on the bed incurs a state of ceremonial pollution. A sheep must be killed, and a bracelet made from its skin must be placed on the arm of the person whose bed gave way; otherwise he or she might die.[3] Again, among the Akikuyu, if a man strikes another who is herding sheep or cattle, so that blood is drawn, the flock or herd is thereby brought into a state of ceremonial pollution. The offender must give a sheep, and the elders kill it, and place a strip of its skin on the wrist of the culprit.[4] Again, when a Kikuyu child has been circumcised, and leaves the village for the first time after the ceremony, if it should happen that in the evening the goats and sheep return from pasture and enter the village before the child has come back, then that child is ceremonially unclean, and may not return to the village till the usual ceremony of expiation has been performed. His father must kill a sheep, and place a strip of its skin on his child's

[1] C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 432.

[2] C. W. Hobley, *l.c.*

[3] C. W. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 435.

[4] C. W. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 436.

arm. Till that is done the child may not return to the village, but must sleep at a neighbouring village, where some of the boys live who went through the ceremony of circumcision along with him.[1] Again, if a Kikuyu man or woman has been bitten by a hyena or a dog, he or she is unclean, and must be purified in the usual way by a medicine-man, who kills a sheep and puts a strip of its skin on the patient's wrist.[2] Further, if a Kikuyu man strikes a woman who is with child, so that she miscarries, the culprit must bring two sheep, which are killed and eaten, the one by the villagers and the elders, the other by the woman and visitors. Moreover, bracelets are made out of the skin of the first of these sheep and placed on the wrists of all persons present who are nearly related either to the offender or to the woman.[3]

Ceremonial use of skins of sacrificial victims at expiations among the Wawanga and the Bantu tribes of Kavirondo.

Expiatory ceremonies of the same kind are performed by the Wawanga, in the Elgon District of British East Africa. For example, if a stranger forces his way into a hut, and in doing so his skin cloak falls to the ground, or if he be bleeding from a fight, and his blood drips on the floor, one of the inmates of the hut will fall sick, unless proper measures are taken to prevent it. The offender must produce a goat. The animal is killed, and the skin, having been removed from its chest and belly, is cut into strips; these strips are stirred round in the contents of the goat's stomach, and every person in the hut puts one of them round his right wrist. If any person in the hut should have fallen sick before this precaution was taken, the strip of skin is tied round his neck, and he rubs some of the goat's dung on his chest. Half of the goat is eaten by the occupants of the hut, and the other half by the stranger in his own village. The same procedure is resorted to by the Wawanga in case the artificial tail which a woman wears has been torn off her, or she should be guilty of the gross impropriety of entering a hut without that appendage. Indeed, the Wawanga believe that a woman may cause her husband's death simply by walking abroad without her tail. To avert the catastrophe the husband demands a goat from her people, and eats it in

[1] C. W. Hobley, *op. cit.* p. 437.

[2] C. W. Hobley, *l.c.*

[3] C. W. Hobley, "Further Researches into Kikuyu and Kamba Religious Beliefs and Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli. (1911) p. 425.

company with his wife, who further ties a strip of skin from the goat's belly round her neck and rubs some of the contents of its stomach on her chest. This saves her husband's life. Again, a man of this tribe, returning from a raid on which he has killed one of the enemy, may not enter his own hut till he has purified himself by the sacrifice of a goat; and he must wear a strip of skin taken from the goat's forehead for the next four days.[1] Once more, the Wawanga, like many other savages, believe that a woman who has given birth to twins is in a very parlous state, and a variety of purificatory ceremonies must be performed before she can leave the hut; otherwise there is no saying what might not happen to her. Among other things they catch a mole and kill it by driving a wooden spike into the back of its neck. Then the animal's belly is split open and the contents of the stomach removed and rubbed on the chests of the mother and the twins. Next, the animal's skin is cut up, and strips of it are tied round the right wrist of each of the twins, and round the mother's neck. They are worn for five days, after which the mother goes to the river, washes, and throws the pieces of skin into the water. The mole's flesh is buried in a hole under the verandah of the hut, before the door, and a pot, with a hole knocked in the bottom, is placed upside down over it.[2] Among the Bantu tribes of Kavirondo, at the north-eastern corner of Lake Victoria Nyanza, it is a rule that only very near relations are allowed to penetrate beyond the first of the two fireplaces which are found, one behind the other, in every hut. Any person who transgresses this rule must kill a goat, and all the occupants of the hut wear small pieces of the skin and smear a little of the dung on their chests.[3]

Ceremonial use of skins of sacrificial victims at transference of government from one generation to another.

Lastly, it may be noticed that a similar use of sacrificial skins is made by some of these East African tribes at certain solemn festivals which are held by them at long intervals determined by the length of the age grades into which the whole population is divided. For example, the Nandi are

[1] Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other Tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 46 *sq.*

[2] Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, *op. cit.* pp. 67 *sq.*

[3] C. W. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda* (London, 1902), p. 15; Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*[2] (London, 1904), ii. 732.

divided into seven such age grades, and the festivals in question are held at intervals of seven and a half years. At each of these festivals the government of the country is transferred from the men of one age grade to the men of the age grade next below it in point of seniority. The chief medicine-man attends, and the proceedings open with the slaughter of a white bullock, which is purchased by the young warriors for the occasion. After the meat has been eaten by the old men, each of the young men makes a small ring out of the hide and puts it on one of the fingers of his right hand. Afterwards the transference of power from the older to the younger men is formally effected, the seniors doffing their warriors' skins and donning the fur garments of old men.[1] At the corresponding ceremony among the Akikuyu, which is held at intervals of about fifteen years, every person puts a strip of skin from a male goat round his wrist before he returns home.[2]

The victim's skin seems intended to protect the wearer by identifying him with the animal.

On a general survey of the foregoing customs we may conclude that the intention of investing a person with a portion of a sacrificial skin is to protect him against some actual or threatened evil, so that the skin serves the purpose of an amulet. This interpretation probably covers even the cases in which the custom is observed at the ratification of a covenant, since the two covenanters thereby guard against the danger which they apprehend from a breach of contract. Similarly, the strange rite of the new birth, or birth from a goat, which the Akikuyu used to observe as a preliminary to circumcision, may be supposed to protect the performers from some evil which would otherwise befall them. As to the mode in which the desired object is effected by this particular means, we may conjecture that by wearing a portion of the animal's skin the man identifies himself with the sacrificial victim, which thus acts as a sort of buffer against the assaults of the evil powers, whether it be that these powers are persuaded or cajoled into taking the beast for the man, or that the blood, flesh, and skin of the victim are thought to be endowed with a certain magical virtue which keeps

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi* (Oxford, 1909), pp. 12 *sq.*

[2] C. W. Hobley, "Further Researches into the Kikuyu and Kamba Religious Beliefs and Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli. (1911) pp. 419 *sq.*, 421.

malignant beings at bay. This identification of the man with the animal comes out most clearly in the Kikuyu rite of the new birth, in which mother and child pretend to be a she-goat and her newborn kid. Arguing from it, we may suppose that in every case the attachment of a piece of sacrificial skin to a person is only an abridged way of wrapping him up in the whole skin for the purpose of identifying him with the beast.

Malagasy ceremony of passing a child through a ring cut from the skin of a sacrificial victim to avert ill-luck.

With these rites we may compare a ceremony performed by certain clans in south-eastern Madagascar for the sake of averting the ill-luck with which a child born under an evil destiny is supposed to be threatened. An ox is sacrificed, and its blood rubbed on the brow and behind the ears of the infant. Moreover, a sort of hoop or large ring is made with a thong cut from the victim's hide, and through this hoop the mother passes with the child in her arms.[1] The custom of passing through a hoop or other narrow opening in order to give the slip to some actual or threatened calamity is widespread in the world;[2] but a special significance attaches to the practice when the aperture is formed by the skin of a sacrificial victim. Like the rite of passing between the pieces of a slaughtered animal,[3] the act of passing through a ring of its hide may perhaps be interpreted as an abridged form of entering into the victim's body in order to be identified with it and so to enjoy the protection of its sacred character.

§ 3. *The New Birth*

The legal fiction of a new birth has been employed by many peoples for the purpose of changing a person's status.

The quaint story of the Diverted Blessing, with its implication of fraud and treachery practised by a designing mother and a crafty son on a doting husband and father, wears another and a far more respectable aspect, if we suppose that the discreditable colour it displays has been imported into it by the narrator, who failed to understand the true nature of the transaction which he described. That

[1] Alfred Grandidier et Guillaume Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. (Paris, 1914) p. 278 (*Histoire Physique, Naturelle et Politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv.).

[2] *Balder the Beautiful*, ii. 168 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part vii.).

[3] Above, vol. i. pp. 392 *sqq.*

transaction, if I am right, was neither more nor less than a legal fiction that Jacob was born again as a goat for the purpose of ranking as the elder instead of the younger son of his mother. We have seen that among the Akikuyu of East Africa, a tribe possibly of Arabian, if not of Semitic, descent, a similar fiction of birth from a goat or a sheep appears to play an important part in the social and religious life of the people. It will be some confirmation of our hypothesis if we can show that the pretence of a new birth, either from a woman or from an animal, has been resorted to by other peoples in cases in which, for one reason or another, it has been deemed desirable that a man should, as it were, strip himself of his old personality and, assuming a new one, make a fresh start in life. In short, at an early stage in the history of law the legal fiction of a new birth has often been employed for the purpose of effecting and marking a change of status. The following instances may serve to illustrate this general proposition.

The fiction of a new birth at adoption in antiquity and the Middle Ages.

In the first place, then, the fiction of a new birth has been made use of, not unnaturally, in cases of adoption for the sake of converting the adopted child into the real child of his adopting mother. Thus the Sicilian historian Diodorus informs us that when Hercules was raised to the rank of the gods, his divine father Zeus persuaded his wife Hera to adopt the bastard as her own true-born son, and this the complacent goddess did by getting into bed, clasping Hercules to her body, and letting him fall through her garments to the ground in imitation of a real birth; and the historian adds that in his own day the barbarians followed the same procedure in adopting a son.[1] During the Middle Ages a similar form of adoption appears to have been observed in Spain and other parts of Europe. The adopted child was taken under the mantle of his adopting father or mother; sometimes he was passed through the folds of the flowing garment. Hence adopted children were called "mantle children."[2] "In several manuscripts of the

[1] Diodorus Siculus, iv. 39. 2.

[2] Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*[3] (Göttingen, 1881), pp. 160 *sq.*, 464 *sq.*; J. J. Bachofen, *Das Mutterrecht* (Stuttgart, 1861). pp. 254 *sq.* See particularly Surita lib. 1 *ind. rer. aragon.* ad a. 1032, quoted by J. Grimm, *op. cit.* p. 464, "*Adoptionis jus illorum temporum instituto more rite sancitum tradunt,*

Cronica General it is told how, on the day when Mudarra was baptized and dubbed a knight, his stepmother put on a very wide shirt over her garments, drew a sleeve of the same over him, and brought him out at the opening for the head, by which action she acknowledged him for her son and heir." This procedure is said to have been a regular form of adoption in Spain,[1] and it is reported to be still in vogue among certain of the Southern Slavs. Thus in some parts of Bulgaria the adoptive mother passes the child under her dress at her feet and brings it out at the level of her breast;[2] and among the Bosnian Turks it is said that "the adoption of a son takes place thus: the future adoptive mother pushes the adoptive child through her hose, and in that way imitates the act of birth."[3] And of the Turks in general we are told that "adoption, which is common among them, is carried out by causing the person who is to be adopted to pass through the shirt of the person who adopts him. That is why, to signify adoption in Turkish, the expression is employed, 'to cause somebody to pass through one's shirt.'"[4]

The fiction of a new birth at adoption among the Southern Slavs and Turks.

In Borneo "some of the Klemantans (Barawans and Lelaks in the Baram) practise a curious symbolic ceremony on the adoption of a child. When a couple has arranged to adopt a child, both man and wife observe for some weeks before the ceremony all the prohibitions usually observed during the later months of pregnancy. Many of these prohibitions may be described in general terms by saying that they imply abstention from every action that may suggest difficulty or delay in delivery; *e.g.* the hand must not be thrust into any narrow hole to pull anything out of it; no fixing of things with wooden pegs must be done;

The fiction of a new birth at adoption among the Klemantans of Borneo.

---

qui is inoleverat, ut qui adoptaret, per stolae fluentis sinus eum qui adoptaretur traduceret"; also Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Paris, 1733–1736), v. 63, *s.v.* "*Pallio cooperire*," "*Cujus ritus initium fluxisse arbitror ab eo, qui in adoptionibus observabatur: quippe adoptivos pallio ac stola propria adoptantes quodammodo involvebant, ut ab iis quasi prognatos indicarent.*"

[1] Felix Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde* (Heilbronn, 1879), p. 432.

[2] Stanislaus Ciszewski, *Künstliche Verwandtschap bei den Südslaven* (Leipsic, 1897), p. 104.

[3] S. Ciszewski, *op. cit.* p. 103, referring to I. F. Jukić, *Bosanski prijatelj* (Sisak, 1870), iv. 175.

[4] B. d'Herbelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale* (The Hague, 1777–1779), i. 156, *s.v.* "Akhrat."

there must be no lingering on the threshold on entering or leaving a room. When the appointed day arrives, the woman sits in her room propped up and with a cloth round her, in the attitude commonly adopted during delivery. The child is pushed forward from behind between the woman's legs, and, if it is a young child, it is put to the breast and encouraged to suck. Later it receives a new name. It is very difficult to obtain admission that a particular child has been adopted and is not the actual offspring of the parents ; and this seems to be due, not so much to any desire to conceal the facts as to the completeness of the adoption, the parents coming to regard the child as so entirely their own that it is difficult to find words which will express the difference between the adopted child and the offspring. This is especially the case if the woman has actually suckled the child."[1] Here it is to be observed that both the adopting parents participate in the legal fiction of the new birth, the pretended father and mother observing the same rules which, among these people, real fathers and mothers observe for the sake of facilitating the real birth of children ; indeed, so seriously do they play their parts in the little domestic drama that they have almost ceased to distinguish the pretence from the reality, and can hardly find words to express the difference between the child they have adopted and the child they have begotten. The force of make-believe could scarcely go farther.

The fiction of a new birth at adoption among the Bahima.

Among the pastoral Bahima of Central Africa, "when a man inherits children of a deceased brother, he takes the children and places them one by one in the lap of his chief wife, who receives them and embraces them and thus accepts them as her own children. Her husband afterwards brings a thong, which he uses for tying the legs of restive cows during milking and binds it round her waist in the manner a midwife binds a woman after childbirth. After this ceremony the children grow up with the family and are counted as part of it."[2] In this ceremony we may detect the simulation of childbirth both in the placing of

[1] Charles Hose and William McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo* (London, 1912), i. 78 *sq.*

[2] John Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 114.

the children on the woman's lap and in the tying of a thong round her waist after the manner of midwives, who do the same for women in actual childbed.

The fiction of a new birth enacted in ancient Greece and India by persons who were erroneously thought to be dead, and for whom funeral rites had been performed.

Further, the pretence of a new birth has been enacted for the benefit of persons who have erroneously been supposed to have died, and for whom in their absence funeral rites have been performed for the purpose of laying their wandering ghosts, who might otherwise haunt and trouble the survivors. The return of such persons to the bosom of their family is embarrassing, since on the principles of imitative magic or make-believe they are theoretically dead, though practically alive. The problem thus created was solved in ancient Greece and ancient India by the legal fiction of a new birth; the returned wanderer had solemnly to pretend to come to life by being born again of a woman before he might mix freely with living folk. Till that pretence had been enacted, the ancient Greeks treated such persons as unclean, refused to associate with them, and excluded them from all participation in religious rites; in particular, they strictly forbade them to enter the sanctuary of the Furies. Before they were restored to the privileges of civil life, they had to be passed through the bosom of a woman's robe, to be washed by a nurse, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and suckled at the breast. Some people thought that the custom originated with a certain Aristinus, for whom in his absence funeral rites had been performed. On his return home, finding himself shunned by all as an outcast, he applied to the Delphic oracle for advice, and was directed by the god to perform the rite of the new birth. Other people, however, with great probability believed that the rite was older than the time of Aristinus and had been handed down from remote antiquity.[1] In ancient India, under the like circumstances, the supposed dead man had to pass the first night after his return in a tub filled with a mixture of fat and water. When he stepped into the tub, his father or next of kin pronounced over him a certain verse, after which he was supposed to have attained to the stage of an embryo in the womb. In that character he sat silent in the tub, with clenched fists,

[1] Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae*, 5; Hesychius, *s.v.* Δευτερόποτμος.

while over him were performed all the sacraments that were regularly celebrated for a woman with child. Next morning he got out of the tub, at the back, and went through all the other sacraments he had formerly partaken of from his youth upwards; in particular he married a wife or espoused his old one over again with due solemnity.[1] This ancient custom appears to be not altogether obsolete in India even at the present day. In Kumaon a person supposed to be dying is carried out of the house, and the ceremony of the remission of sins is performed over him by his next of kin. But should he afterwards recover, he must go through all the ceremonies previously performed by him from his birth upwards, such as putting on the sacred thread and marrying wives, though he sometimes marries his old wives over again.[2]

The fiction of a new birth enacted in ancient India by a Brahman for the purpose of raising himself to the rank of a god.

But in ancient India the rite of the new birth was also enacted for a different and far more august purpose. A Brahman householder who performed the regular half-monthly sacrifices was supposed thereby to become himself a god for the time being,[3] and in order to effect this transition from the human to the divine, from the mortal to the immortal, it was necessary for him to be born again. For this purpose he was sprinkled with water as a symbol of seed. He feigned to be an embryo and as such was shut up in a special hut representing the womb. Under his robe he wore a belt, and over it the skin of a black antelope; the belt stood for the navel-string, and the robe and the black antelope skin typified the inner and outer membranes (the amnion and chorion) in which an embryo is wrapped. He might not scratch himself with his nails or a stick, because he was an embryo, and were an embryo scratched with nails or a stick, it would die. If he moved about in the hut, it was because a child moves about in the womb. If he kept his fists clenched, it was because an unborn babe

[1] W. Caland, *Die altindischen Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuchen* (Amsterdam, 1896), p. 89 (*Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, Deel i. No. 6).

[2] Major Reade, "Death Customs—Kumaun," *Panjab Notes and Queries*, ii. p. 74, § 452 (February, 1885).

[3] *Satapatha-Brâhmana*, translated by J. Eggeling, Part ii. (Oxford, 1885) pp. 4, 20, 29, 38, 42, 44 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxvi.); H. Hubert et M. Mauss, "Essai sur le Sacrifice," *L'Année Sociologique*, ii. (1897–1898) pp. 48 *sqq.*

does the same. If in bathing he put off the black antelope skin but retained his robe, it was because the child is born with the amnion but not with the chorion. By these observances he acquired, besides his old natural and mortal body, a new and glorified body, invested with superhuman powers and encircled with an aureole of fire. Thus by a new birth, a regeneration of his carnal nature, the man became a god.[1]

The fiction of a new birth employed in modern India as an expiation to atone for the breach of ancestral custom.

Thus we see that the ceremony of the new birth may serve different purposes, according as it is employed to raise a supposed dead man to life or to elevate a living man to the rank of a deity. In modern India it has been, and indeed still is, occasionally performed as an expiatory rite to atone for some breach of ancestral custom. The train of thought which has prompted this use of the ceremony is obvious enough. The sinner who has been born again becomes thereby a new man and ceases to be responsible for the sins committed by him in his former state of existence; the process of regeneration is at the same time a process of purification, the old nature has been put off and an entirely new one put on. For example, among the Korkus, an aboriginal tribe of the Munda or Kolarian stock in the Central Provinces of India, social offences of an ordinary kind are punished by the tribal council, which inflicts the usual penalties, but "in very serious cases, such as intercourse with a low caste, it causes the offender to be born again. He is placed inside a large earthen pot which is sealed up, and when taken out of this he is said to be born again from his mother's womb. He is then buried in sand and comes out as a fresh incarnation from the earth, placed in a grass hut which is fired and from within which he runs out as it is burning, immersed in water, and finally has a tuft cut from his scalp-lock and is fined two and a half rupees."[2] Here the ceremony of

The fiction of a new birth observed as an expiation for breach of tribal custom among the Korkus of India

[1] Sylvain Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice dans les Brâhmanas* (Paris, 1898), pp. 102-107; H. Hubert et M. Mauss, "Essai sur le Sacrifice," *L'Année Sociologique*, ii. (1897-1898) pp. 48 *sqq.*; *Satapatha Brâhmana*, Part ii. (Oxford, 1885) pp. 18-20, 25-35, 73, Part v. (Oxford, 1900) pp. 23 *sq.* (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vols. xxvi. and xliv.). Compare *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, i. 380 *sq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part i.).

[2] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), iii. 568.

the new birth seems clearly intended to relieve the culprit from all responsibility for his former acts by converting him into an entirely new person. With what show of reason could he be held to account for an offence committed by somebody else before he was born?

The fiction of a new birth from a golden or bronze cow enacted as an expiation by persons of high rank in India.

Far more elaborate and costly is the ceremony of the new birth when the sinner who is to be regenerated is a person of high birth or exalted dignity. In the eighteenth century "when the unfortunate Raghu-Náth-Ráya or Ragoba, sent two Brahmens as embassadors to England, they went by sea as far as Suez, but they came back by the way of Persia, and of course crossed the Indus. On their return they were treated as outcasts, because they conceived it hardly possible for them to travel through countries inhabited by *Mlec'h'has* or impure tribes, and live according to the rules laid down in their sacred books: it was also alledged, that they had crossed the Attaca. Numerous meetings were held in consequence of this, and learned Brahmens were convened from all parts. The influence and authority of Raghu-Náth-Ráya could not save his embassadors. However, the holy assembly decreed, that in consideration of their universal good character, and of the motive of their travelling to distant countries, which was solely to promote the good of their country, they might be regenerated and have the sacerdotal ordination renewed. For the purpose of regeneration, it is directed to make an image of pure gold of the female power of nature; in the shape either of a woman or of a cow. In this statue the person to be regenerated is enclosed and dragged through the usual channel. As a statue of pure gold and of proper dimensions would be too expensive, it is sufficient to make an image of the sacred *Yoni*, through which the person to be regenerated is to pass. Raghu-Náth-Ráya had one made of pure gold and of proper dimensions: his embassadors were regenerated, and the usual ceremonies of ordination having been performed, and immense presents bestowed on the Brahmens, they were re-admitted into the communion of the faithful."[1]

[1] Captain Francis Wilford, "On Mount Caucasus," *Asiatick Researches*, vi. (London, 1801) pp. 537 *sq.* (octavo edition). The passage is reprinted in Charles Coleman's *Mythology of the Hindus* (London, 1832), pp. 150 *sq.* Raghu-Náth-Ráya or Ragoba (Raghunāth Rao or Raghuba) was an unsuc-

Again, "it is on record that the Tanjore Nayakar, having betrayed Madura and suffered for it, was told by his Brahman advisers that he had better be born again. So a colossal cow was cast in bronze, and the Nayakar shut up inside. The wife of his Brahman guru [teacher] acted as nurse, received him in her arms, rocked him on her knees, and caressed him on her breast, and he tried to cry like a baby."[1]

The fiction of a new birth from a golden cow enacted by the Maharajahs of Travancore for the purpose of raising themselves to the rank of Brahmans.

In India the fiction of a new birth has further been employed for the purpose of raising a man of low caste into a social rank higher than the one to which his first or real birth had consigned him. For example, the Maharajahs of Travancore belong to the Sudra caste, the lowest of the four great Indian castes, but they appear regularly to exalt themselves to a level with the Brahmans, the highest caste, by being born again either from a large golden cow or from a large golden lotus-flower. Hence the ceremony is called *Hiranya Garbham*, "the golden womb," or *Patma Garbha Dānam*, "the lotus womb-gift," according as the effigy, from which the Maharajah emerged new-born, represented a cow or a lotus-flower. When James Forbes was at Travancore, the image through which the potentate passed was that of a cow made of pure gold; and after his passage through it the image was broken up and distributed among the Brahmans. But when the ceremony was performed by the Rajah Martanda Vurmah in July 1854, the image was cast in the form of a lotus-flower and was estimated to have cost about £6000. Inside the golden vessel had been placed a small quantity of the consecrated mixture, composed of the five products of the cow (milk, curd, butter, urine, and dung); which suggests that the proper rebirth for the Maharajah is rather from the sacred cow than from the sacred lotus. After entering the vessel, His Highness remained within it for the prescribed time, while the officiating priests repeated prayers appropriate to the occasion.[2]

---

cessful claimant for the Peshwaship of the Marathas, and his claims were supported by the British. His son succeeded to the office in 1796. See *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire*, ii. (Oxford, 1909) pp. 442 *sq.*

[1] Edgar Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), pp. 271 *sq.*

[2] James Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs* (London, 1813), i. 378; Samuel Mateer, *The Land of Charity* (London, 1871), pp. 169-171.

Later accounts of the ceremony of the new birth from a cow as performed by the Maharajahs of Travancore.

From later notices of the ceremony we may infer that the Maharajahs have since reverted to the other, and perhaps more orthodox, form of the new birth, namely the birth from a cow. Thus in the year 1869 it was announced that "another not less curious ceremony, called *Ernjagherpum*, will take place next year, whereat His Highness (the Maharajah of Travancore) will go through a golden cow, which thereupon will also become the property of the priests."[1] Again, we read that "the Maharaja of Travancore, a Native State in the extreme South of India, has just completed the second and last of the costly ceremonies known as 'going through the golden cow,' which he has to perform in order to rank more or less on the same footing as a Brahman—his original caste being that of Sudra. The first of these ceremonies is known as *Thulapurusha danam*—Sanskrit *Thula*, scales; *purusha*, man; and *danam*, gift of a religious character. The ceremony consists in the Maharaja entering the scales against an equal weight of gold coins, which are afterwards distributed among Brahmans. . . . The second ceremony is known as the *Hirannya garbham*—Sanskrit *hirannya*, gold; and *garbham*, womb—and constitutes the process known as going through the golden cow. A large golden vessel is constructed, ten feet in height and eight feet in circumference. This vessel is half filled with water, mixed with the various products of the cow, and Brahmans perform the prescribed rites over it. The Maharaja next enters the vessel by means of a specially constructed ornamental ladder. The cover is then put on, and the Raja immerses himself five times in the contained fluid, while the Brahmans keep up a chanted accompaniment of prayers and Vedic hymns. This portion of the ceremony lasts about ten minutes, after which time the Maharaja emerges from the vessel and prostrates himself before the image of the deity of the Travancore kings. The high priest now places the crown of Travancore on the Raja's head, and after this he is considered to have rendered himself holy by having passed through the golden cow. The previous ceremony of

[1] Felix Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde* (Heilbronn, 1879), p. 397, referring to the *Madras Mail*, as quoted by the *Augsb. Allgem. Zeitung*, 1869, No. 255, S. 3941.[b]

being weighed against gold simply fitted him for performing the more exalted and more costly ceremony of going through the golden cow. The cost of these curious ceremonies is very great; for quite apart from the actual value of the gold, much expenditure is incurred in feasting the vast concourse of Brahmans who assemble in Trevandrum on these occasions. From time immemorial, however, the Rajas of Travancore have performed these ceremonies, and any omission on their part to do so would be regarded as an offence against the traditions of the country, which is a very stronghold of Hindu superstition."[1]

If none could be born again save such as can afford to provide a colossal cow of pure gold for the ceremony, it seems obvious that the chances of regeneration for the human race generally would be but slender, and that practically none but the rich could enter into the realms of bliss through this singular aperture. Fortunately, however, the expedient of employing a real cow instead of a golden image places the rite of the new birth within the reach even of the poor and lowly, and thus opens to multitudes a gate of paradise which otherwise would have been barred and bolted against them. Indeed we may with some probability conjecture, that birth from a live cow was the original form of the ceremony, and that the substitution of a golden image for the real animal was merely a sop thrown to the pride of Rajahs and other persons of high degree, who would have esteemed it a blot on their scutcheon to be born in vulgar fashion, like common folk, from a common cow. Be that as it may, certain it is that in some parts of India a real live cow still serves as the instrument of the new birth. Thus in the Himalayan districts of the North-Western Provinces "the ceremony of being born again from the cow's mouth (*gomukhaprasava*) takes place when the horoscope foretells some crime on the part of the native or some deadly calamity to him. The child is clothed in scarlet [illegible] tied on a new sieve, which is passed between the hind-l[illegible] a cow forward through the fore-legs to the mouth and [illegible] in the reverse direction, signifying the new birth. [illegible]d again [illegible]he usual

At the fiction of a new birth from a cow in India a real live cow is sometimes employed instead of an image.

[1] *North Indian Notes and Queries*, iii. p. 215, § 465 (March, 1894), quoting the *Pioneer*, bu[illegible] the date of the paper[illegible] without giving

worship, aspersion, etc., takes place, and the father smells his son as the cow smells her calf."[1] Here, though it is necessarily impossible to carry out the simulation of birth completely by passing the child through the body of the living cow, the next best thing is done by passing it backwards and forwards between the cow's legs; thus the infant is assimilated to a calf, and the father acts the part of its dam by smelling his offspring as a cow smells hers. Similarly in Southern India, when a man has for grave cause been expelled from his caste, he may be restored to it after passing several times under the belly of a cow.[2] Though the writer who reports this custom does not describe it as a ceremony of rebirth, we may reasonably regard it as such in the light of the foregoing evidence. A further extenuation of the original ceremony may perhaps be seen in the practice of placing an unlucky child in a basket before a good milch cow with a calf and allowing the cow to lick the child, "by which operation the noxious qualities which the child has derived from its birth are removed."[3]

The elaborate rite of the new birth from an animal tends to dwindle into an abridged form.

If the rite of birth from a cow could thus dwindle down into one of which, without a knowledge of the complete ceremony, we could hardly divine the true meaning, it seems not improbable that the rite of birth from a goat may have similarly dwindled from its full form, such as we find it among the Akikuyu,[4] into a greatly abridged form, such as the practice of putting the animal's skin on the hands of the person who is to be regenerated. Consistently with this hypothesis we see that this latter practice is commonly observed on a variety of occasions by the Akikuyu,[5] the very people who on solemn occasions observe the ceremony of the new birth at full length. Is it not natural to suppose that in the hurry and bustle of ordinary existence, which does not admit of tedious ceremonial, the people have contracted the sovereign remedy of the new birth, with its

[redacted]dwin T. Atkinson, *The Himalayan Districts of the North-Western Provinces of India*, ii. (Allahabad, 1884), p. 914. Compare *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, liii. (1884) Part i. p. 101.

[2] J. A. Dubois, *Mœurs, Institutions et Cérémonies des Peuples de l'Inde* (Paris, 1825), i. 42.

[3] Alexander Mackintosh, *Account of the Origin and Present Condition of the Tribe of Ramoosies* (Bombay, 1833), p. 124.

[4] Above, pp. 7 *sqq.*

[5] Above, pp. 10 *sq.*, 15, 20, 23 *sq.*

elaborate details, into a compendious and convenient shape which they can apply without needless delay in the lesser emergencies of life?

§ 4. *Conclusion*

To return now to the point from which we started, I conjecture that the story of the deception practised by Jacob on his father Isaac contains a reminiscence of an ancient legal ceremony of new birth from a goat, which it was deemed necessary or desirable to observe whenever a younger son was advanced to the rights of the firstborn at the expense of his still living brother; just as in India to this day a man pretends to be born again from a cow when he desires to be promoted to a higher caste or to be restored to the one which he has forfeited through his misfortune or misconduct. But among the Hebrews, as among the Akikuyu, the quaint ceremony may have dwindled into a simple custom of killing a goat and placing pieces of its skin on the person who was supposed to be born again as a goat. In this degenerate form, if my conjecture is well founded, the ancient rite has been reported and misunderstood by the Biblical narrator.

In this abridged form, the ceremony of the new birth may perhaps be detected in the story of Jacob and the kidskins.

CHAPTER IV

JACOB AT BETHEL

§ 1. *Jacob's Dream*

Jacob sent away by his mother to her brother Laban in Haran.

THE treachery of Jacob to Esau, as it is represented in the Biblical narrative, naturally led to an estrangement between the brothers. The elder brother smarted under a sense of intolerable wrong, and his passionate nature prompted him to avenge it on his crafty younger brother, who had robbed him of his heritage. Jacob therefore went in fear of his life, and his mother, who had been his accomplice in the deceit, shared his fears and schemed to put him in a place of safety till the anger of his hot-tempered, but generous and placable, brother had cooled down. So she hit upon the device of sending him away to her brother, Laban, in Haran.[1] Memories of the far home beyond the great river, from which in the bloom of her youthful beauty she had been brought to be the bride of Isaac, rose up before her mind and perhaps touched her somewhat hard and worldly heart. How well she remembered that golden evening when she lighted from her camel to meet yon solitary figure pacing meditatively in the fields, and found in him her husband![2] That manly form was now a blind bedridden dotard; and only last evening, when she looked into the well, she saw mirrored there in the water a wrinkled face and grizzled hair—a ghost and shadow of her former self! Well, well, how time slips by! It would be some consolation for the ravages of years if her

[1] Genesis xxvii. 41-45. This passage is part of the Jehovistic narrative. A different explanation of Jacob's departure to Haran is given by the Priestly writer (Genesis xxvii. 46-xxviii. 5), who assigns for its motive the wish of the parents to marry their son to one of their own kinsfolk; thus the writer ignores as unedifying the story of the quarrel between the brothers.

[2] Genesis xxiv.

favourite son should bring back from her native land a fair young wife in whom she might see an image of her own lost youth. This thought may have occurred to the fond mother in parting with her son, though, if we may trust the Jehovistic writer, she said not a word of it to him.[1]

Jacob's journey and his dream at Bethel.

So Jacob departed. From Beer-Sheba, on the verge of the desert in the extreme south of Canaan, he took his journey northward. He must have traversed the bleak uplands of Judea, and still pursuing his northward way by a rough and fatiguing footpath he came at evening, just as the sun was setting, to a place where, weary and footsore, with the darkness closing in upon him, he decided to pass the night. It was a desolate spot. He had been gradually ascending and now stood at a height of about three thousand feet above sea-level. The air was keen and nipping. Around him, so far as the falling shadows permitted him to judge, lay a wilderness of stony fields and grey rocks, some of them piled up in weird forms of pillars, menhirs, or cromlechs, while a little way off a bare hill loomed dimly skyward, its sides appearing to rise in a succession of stony terraces. It was a dreary landscape, and the traveller had little temptation to gaze long upon it. He laid himself down in the centre of a circle of great stones, resting his head on one of them as a pillow, and fell asleep. As he slept, he dreamed a dream. He thought he saw a ladder reaching from earth to heaven and angels plying up and down it. And God stood by him and promised to give all that land to him and to his seed after him. But Jacob woke from his sleep in terror and said, "How dreadful is this place! This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." He lay still, trembling till morning broke over the desolate landscape, revealing the same forbidding prospect of stony fields and grey rocks on which his eyes had rested the evening before. Then he arose, and taking the stone on which he had laid his head he set it up as a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it, and called the place Bethel, that is, the House of God.[2] Over-

The heavenly ladder.

The stone set up and anointed.

[1] Genesis xxvii. 41-45.

[2] Genesis xxviii. 10-22. Bethel is the modern village of Beitin. A little to the north of the village is a remarkable circle of stones, which tradition probably identified with the spot where Jacob slept and dreamed his dream. As to the place and the scenery see

awed though he was by the vision of the night, we may suppose that he pursued his journey that day in better spirits for the divine promise which he had received. As he went on, too, the landscape itself soon began to wear a more smiling and cheerful aspect in harmony with the new hopes springing up in his breast. He left behind him the bleak highlands of Benjamin and descended into the rich lowlands of Ephraim. For hours the path led down a lovely glen where the hill-sides were terraced to the top and planted with fig-trees and olives, the white rocks tapestried with ferns and embroidered with pink and white cyclamens and crocuses, while woodpeckers, jays, and little owls laughed, tapped, or hooted, each after its kind, among the boughs.[1] So with a lighter heart he sped him on his way to the far country.

§ 2. *Dreams of the Gods*

Belief that the gods reveal themselves to their worshippers in dreams.

As critics have seen, the story of Jacob's dream was probably told to explain the immemorial sanctity of Bethel, which may well have been revered by the aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan long before the Hebrews invaded and conquered the land. The belief that the gods revealed themselves and declared their will to mankind in dreams was widespread in antiquity; and accordingly people resorted to temples and other sacred spots for the purpose of sleeping there and holding converse with the higher powers in visions of the night, for they naturally supposed that the deities or the deified spirits of the dead would be most likely to manifest themselves in places specially dedicated to their worship. For example, at Oropus in Attica there was a

Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Second Edition (London, 1856), i. 448-451; A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, Second Edition (London, 1856), pp. 217 *sq.*; C. R. Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine* (London, 1885), pp. 251 *sq.*; (Sir) George Adam Smith, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, i. col. 552, *s.v.* "Bethel"; *id.*, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London, 1894), pp. 289 *sqq.*; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, Fourth Edition (London, 1882), pp. 162 *sq.*; K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*, Fourth Edition (Leipsic and London, 1906), p. 213; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, Tenth Edition (London, 1916), p. 264; Principal J. Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 378.

[1] H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, Fourth Edition (London, 1882), p. 161.

sanctuary of the dead soothsayer Amphiaraus, where inquirers used to sacrifice rams to him and to other divine beings, whose names were inscribed on the altar; and having offered the sacrifice they spread the skins of the rams on the ground and slept on them, expecting revelations in dreams.[1] The oracle appears to have been chiefly frequented by sick people who sought a release from their sufferings, and, when they had found it, testified their gratitude by dropping gold or silver coins into the sacred spring.[2] Livy tells us that the ancient temple of Amphiaraus was delightfully situated among springs and brooks,[3] and the discovery of the site in modern times has confirmed his description. The place is in a pleasant little glen, neither wide nor deep, among low hills partially wooded with pine. A brook flows through it and finds its way between banks fringed by plane-trees and oleanders to the sea, distant about a mile. In the distance the high blue mountains of Euboea close the view. The clumps of trees and shrubs, which tuft the sides of the glen and in which the nightingale warbles, the stretch of green meadows at the bottom, the stillness and seclusion of the spot, and its sheltered and sunny aspect, all fitted it to be the resort of invalids, who thronged thither to consult the healing god. So sheltered indeed is the spot that even on a May morning the heat in the airless glen, with the Greek sun beating down out of a cloudless sky, is apt to be felt by a northerner as somewhat overpowering. But to a Greek it was probably agreeable.[4] The oracle indeed appears to have been open only in summer, for the priest was bound to be in attendance at the sanctuary not less than ten days a month from the end of winter till the ploughing season, which fell at the time of the setting of the Pleiades in November; and during these summer months he might not absent himself for more than three days at a time. Every patient who sought the advice of the god had first of all to pay a fee of not less than nine obols (about a shilling) of

Dreams in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus in Attica.

The consultation of the oracle.

[1] Pausanias i. 34. 5. As to the mode in which Amphiaraus is said to have acquired his power of divination, see Pausanias ii. 13. 7.

[2] Pausanias i. 34. 2-5.

[3] Livy xlv. 27.

[4] I have described the site as I saw it on a day in May many years ago. For an account of the ruins of the sanctuary, which have been excavated in modern times, I may refer to my notes on Pausanias i. 34 (vol. ii. pp. 463 *sqq.*).

good silver into the treasury, in presence of the sacristan, who thereupon entered his name and the name of his city in a public register. When the priest was in attendance, it was his duty to pray over the sacrificial victims and lay their flesh on the altar; but in his absence the person who presented the sacrifice might perform these offices himself. The skin and a shoulder of every victim sacrificed were the priest's perquisites. None of the flesh might be removed from the precinct. Every person who complied with these rules was allowed to sleep in the sanctuary for the purpose of receiving an oracle in a dream. In the dormitory the men and women slept apart, divided by the altar, the men on the east and the women on the west.[1]

Dreams in the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Epidaurus.

There was a similar dormitory for the use of patients who came to consult the Good Physician in the great sanctuary of Aesculapius near Epidaurus. The ruins of the sanctuary, covering a wide area, have been excavated in modern times, and together form one of the most impressive monuments of ancient Greek civilization. They stand in a fine open valley encircled by lofty mountains, on the north-west rising into sharp peaks of grey and barren rock, but on the south and east of softer outlines and verdurous slopes. In spring the level bottom of the valley, interspersed with clumps of trees and bushes, is green with corn. The whole effect of the landscape is still and solemn, with a certain pleasing solitariness; for it lies remote from towns. A wild, romantic, densely wooded glen leads down to the ruins of the ancient Epidaurus, beautifully situated on a rocky promontory, which juts out into the sea from a plain covered with lemon groves and backed by high wooded mountains.[2] Patients who had slept in the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Epidaurus, and had been healed of their infirmities through the revelations accorded to them in dreams, used to commemorate the cures on tablets, which were set up in the holy place as eloquent testimonies to the restorative powers

The votive tablets at Epidaurus.

[1] These particulars we learn from an inscription discovered on the spot. See *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum Graeciae Septentrionalis*, vol. i. (Berlin, 1892) pp. 70 *sqq.*, No. 235; Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, 1885, pp. 93 *sqq.*; Ch. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques* (Brussels, 1900), pp. 604 *sq.*, No. 698.

[2] I have described these scenes from personal observation. The reader will find fuller particulars in my Pausanias, vol. iii. 236 *sqq.*, vol. v. 570 *sqq.*

of the god and to the saving faith of those who put their trust in him. The sacred precinct was crowded with such tablets in antiquity,[1] and some of them have been discovered in modern times. The inscriptions shed a curious light on institutions which in some respects answered to the hospitals of modern times.

Records at Epidaurus of cures effected through dreams.

For example, we read how a man whose fingers were all paralysed but one, came as a suppliant to the god. But when he saw the tablets in the sanctuary and the miraculous cures recorded on them, he was incredulous. However, he fell asleep in the dormitory and dreamed a dream. He thought he was playing at dice in the temple, and that, as he was in the act of throwing, the god appeared, pounced on his hand, and stretched out his fingers, one after the other, and, having done so, asked him whether he still disbelieved the inscriptions on the tablets in the sanctuary. The man said no, he did not. "Therefore," answered the god, "because you disbelieved them before, your name shall henceforth be Unbeliever." Next morning the man went forth whole.

Cure of a paralytic man.

Cure of a one-eyed lady.

Again, Ambrosia, a one-eyed lady of Athens, came to consult the god about her infirmity. Walking about the sanctuary she read the cures on the tablets and laughed at some of them as plainly incredible and impossible. "How could it be," said she, "that the lame and the blind should be made whole by simply dreaming a dream?" In this sceptical frame of mind she composed herself to sleep in the dormitory, and as she slept she saw a vision. It seemed to her that the god stood by her and promised to restore the sight of her other eye, on condition that she should dedicate a silver pig in the sanctuary as a memorial of her crass infidelity. Having given this gracious promise, he slit open her ailing eye and poured balm on it. Next day she went forth healed.

The case of Pandarus and the letters branded on his brow.

Again, Pandarus, a Thessalian, came to the sanctuary in order to get rid of certain scarlet letters which had been branded on his brow. In his dream he thought that the god stood by him, bound a scarf about his brow, and commanded him, when he went forth from

[1] Strabo viii. 6. 15, p. 374, ed. Casaubon; Pausanias ii. 27. 3. When Pausanias visited the sanctuary in the second century of our era, only six of these tablets were left.

the dormitory, to take off the scarf and dedicate it in the temple. Next morning Pandarus arose and unbound the scarf from his head, and on looking at it he saw that the infamous letters were transferred from his brow to the scarf. So he dedicated the scarf in the temple and departed. On his way home he stopped at Athens, and despatched his servant Echedorus to Epidaurus with a present of money, which he was to dedicate as a thank-offering in the temple. Now Echedorus, too, had letters of shame branded on his brow, and when he came to the sanctuary, instead of paying the money into the treasury of the god, he kept it and laid himself down to sleep in the dormitory, hoping to rid himself of the marks on his forehead, just as his master had done. In his dream the god stood by him and asked whether he had brought any money from Pandarus to dedicate in the sanctuary. The fellow denied that he had received anything from Pandarus, but promised that, if the god would heal him, he would have his portrait painted and would dedicate it to the deity. The god bade him take the scarf of Pandarus and tie it round his forehead; and when he went out of the dormitory he was to take off the scarf, wash his face in the fountain, and look at himself in the water. So, when it was day, the rascal hurried out of the dormitory, untied the scarf and scanned it eagerly, expecting to see the brand-marks imprinted on it. But they were not there. Next he went to the fountain, and, looking at his face reflected in the water, he saw the red letters of Pandarus printed on his brow in addition to his own. Again, we hear of Euphanes, a boy of Epidaurus, who suffered from stone. As he slept and dreamed in the sanctuary, the god appeared to him and said, "What will you give me if I make you whole?" "I'll give you ten knuckle-bones," said the boy. The god laughed, and promised to cure him. Next day the boy went out whole. Again, there came a man to the sanctuary so blind of one eye that nothing was left of it but the empty socket and eyelid. Some even of the temple officials thought his case hopeless, and said that he was a fool to fancy he could ever see again with an empty socket. Nothing daunted, he slept in the dormitory, and in his dream he thought the

The case of Echedorus and the letters branded on his brow.

Cure of stone.

Cure of a one-eyed man.

god boiled a certain drug, and then, raising the lid of the blind eye, poured it into the empty socket. Next day the man went out of the sanctuary seeing with both his eyes. Again, a certain man named Aeschines, curious to behold the sick folk sleeping in the sanctuary, climbed up a tree and peeped over the wall. But craning his neck to get a better view of them he lost his balance, and falling on two stakes put out both his eyes. Nevertheless, he prayed to the god, slept in the sanctuary, and recovered his sight. Then we read of a certain Euippus, who had a splinter of a spear sticking in his jaw for six years. As he slept, the god came, drew the splinter from his jaw, and placed it in his hands. Next morning he walked out of the dormitory with the splinter, sure enough, in his hands. Again, a man from Torone, in Macedonia, suffered from intestinal worms, which his stepmother had administered to him in a posset. In his dream, he thought that the god cut open his chest with a knife, took out the worms, and having put them in his hands, sewed up the wound in his breast. Next morning he in like manner walked out of the sanctuary with the worms in his hands. Again, we read of a man who suffered from a grievous ulcer on one of his toes. The attendants carried him out and set him on a bench. It was broad day, but sitting there on the bench he fell fast asleep, and as he slept, a serpent crawled out of the dormitory, licked his ulcer, and healed it. When he awoke from his nap, the man said that he had dreamed of a comely youth who had laid a healing balm on the sore. Again, we hear of a blind man named Alcetas, from the town of Halice, in Argolis, who saw in his dream the god opening his blind eyes with his own divine fingers, so that he could see the trees in the sanctuary. Next day he went forth with his sight restored. Further, the case is recorded of a certain Heraeus of Mytilene, who had no hair on his head but a long beard on his chin. Ashamed of the ridiculous contrast, which subjected him to a fire of raillery, he slept in the sanctuary, and in his dream it seeemd to him that the god rubbed his bald pate with an ointment, which produced a crop of hair.[1]

Surgical operations performed by Aesculapius on patients in dreams.

Ulcer healed by a serpent.

Cure of a blind man.

Cure of a bald-headed man.

[1] Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, Athens, 1883, coll. 197-228; H. Collitz und F. Bechtel, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, iii. Erste Hälfte

Other cures at Epidaurus.

All these cases are recorded on a single tablet which was found among the ruins of the sanctuary, and which appears to have been seen there by the Greek traveller Pausanias in the second century of our era.[1] On another tablet, which has been recovered on the site, we read of a

Cure of a dropsy.

Laconian woman named Arata who suffered from a dropsy. So her mother made a pilgrimage on her behalf to the sanctuary of Aesculapius at Epidaurus. There she slept and dreamed a dream, and in her dream she thought that the god cut off her daughter's head and hung up the headless body neck downwards, so that all the water ran out; then he took down the body, and clapped on the head again. When the mother returned to Lacedaemon, she found that her daughter had dreamed the same dream and was now perfectly cured. Again, the case of Aristagora of Troezen

An operation for worms.

presents some remarkable features. She suffered from an intestinal worm, and in order to be cured she slept and dreamed a dream in the local precinct of Aesculapius at Troezen. It seemed to her that in the absence of the god, who was away at Epidaurus, his sons cut off her head to extract the worm, but that, being unable to fit the head on the trunk again, they sent a messenger to Epidaurus to fetch their divine father. At that point the lady awoke, and when the day dawned, the priest, to whom no doubt she had told her dream, averred that he saw with his waking eyes the severed and gory head. However, next night the lady had another dream: she thought she saw the god, who had come from Epidaurus, putting her head on her body and then slitting open her stomach, extracting the worm, and

(Göttingen, 1,899) pp. 151-157, No. 3339; Ch. Michel, *Recueil d'Inscriptions Grecques* (Brussels, 1900), pp. 823-827, No. 1069; Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*[2] (Leipsic, 1898-1901), ii. pp. 649-656, No. 802.

[1] Pausanias ii. 36. 1, "Though Halice in our day is deserted, it was once inhabited. Mention is made of natives of Halice on the Epidaurian tablets, which record the cures wrought by Aesculapius; but I know of no other authentic document in which mention is made of the town or its inhabitants." We have just seen that the case of a blind man from Halice is recorded on one of the recovered tablets, and we shall meet with (p. 49) another case of a patient from Halice of which the record has survived the wreck of ages. In modern times the accuracy and good faith of Pausanias have been rashly impugned by some German critics, but the stones of Greece have risen up to refute them and to justify him.

stitching up the wound. After that she was quite cured. Again, a boy named Aristocritus, of Halice,[1] dived into the sea, and being entangled among the rocks never came to the surface again. His sorrowing father slept on his behalf in the sanctuary of Aesculapius, and in his dream he thought that the god led him to a certain place and told him that his lost son was there. Next day, on quitting the sanctuary, he went straight to the spot, and having caused the rock to be cut open, found his son there after seven days. Again, we read of a man who was afflicted with an internal ulcer. He slept in the sanctuary and dreamed a dream. In his dream it seemed to him that the god commanded his servants to take and hold him, that he might cut open his belly; at that he fled, but the servants of the god laid hold on him and tied him to a post, whereupon Aesculapius slit open his belly, removed the ulcer, and sewed up the wound, after which he was released from his bonds. Next morning he went forth whole, but the floor of the dormitory was full of blood. Again, a Theban named Clinatas suffered from a plague of lice, with which his body swarmed. So he came to the sanctuary and slept there. And in a dream he thought that the god stripped him naked, set him up, and swept the lice from his body with a broom. Next morning he went forth from the dormitory perfectly cured. Again, a certain Agestratus used to suffer from headache, so that he could not sleep at night for the pain. However, when he entered the dormitory he fell fast asleep, and in his dream he thought that the god healed his headache, stripped him naked, and taught him the rough-and-tumble (*pancratium*). When day broke he went forth cured, and not long after he won a prize at Nemea in the rough-and-tumble. Again, Gorgias of Heraclea was wounded in a battle by an arrow, the point of which remained sticking in one of his lungs. The wound suppurated to such an extent, that in eighteen months the discharged matter filled sixty-seven pans. Well, he slept in the sanctuary and dreamed that the god extracted the point of the arrow from his lung. Next day he went forth cured, with the point of the arrow

Recovery of a drowned boy.

Cure of an ulcer.

Cure of lice.

Cure of headache.

Cure of a suppurating wound.

[1] See above, p. 48, note [1].

in his hands. Another man, who had lost both his eyes by the thrust of a spear in a battle, carried about the head of the spear in his forehead for a whole year. When he slept in the sanctuary he dreamed that the god drew out the blade and replaced his eyeballs in the sockets. Next day he went forth with both his eyes as good as ever. Again, a certain Diaetus suffered from a weakness of the knees, which prevented him from standing upright. Sleeping in the sanctuary he dreamed that the god commanded his servants to take him up, carry him forth from the dormitory, and set him down in front of the temple. Then the god mounted a chariot and drove round the temple, trampling the body of poor Diaetus under the hoofs of his horses. Strange to say, this effected a complete cure, for next morning Diaetus walked out as firm on his legs as anybody. Again, we read of two childless women who came to the sanctuary in the hope that the god would grant them offspring. One of them, Andromeda of Ceos, dreamed that a serpent crawled forth and lay upon her; after which she bore five children. The other woman, Nicasibula a Messenian, dreamed that the god brought a great serpent and made it lie down beside her. She fondled the reptile, and in a year from that time she was delivered of twin boys.[1] In these last cases, as in the case of the man whose ulcer was healed by a serpent,[2] the reptile is the animal embodiment of the god himself; for Aesculapius was often conceived and represented in the form of a snake.[3]

Cure of a blind man.

Cure of weak knees.

Serpent begets children on women in dreams.

Again, on the wild ironbound coast of Laconia, where the great range of Taygetus descends in naked crags to the sea, there was an oracular shrine, where a goddess revealed their hearts' desires to mortals in dreams. Different opinions prevailed as to who the goddess was. The Greek traveller Pausanias, who visited the place, thought that she was Ino,

Dream oracle of Ino or Pasiphae in Laconia.

[1] Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική, Athens, 1885, coll. 1-28; H. Collitz und F. Bechtel, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, iii. Erste Hälfte (Göttingen, 1899), pp. 157-162, No. 3340; Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*[2] (Leipsic, 1898-1901), ii. pp. 656-663, No. 803.

[2] See above, p. 47.

[3] Pausanias ii. 10. 3. In a note on that passage (vol. iii. p. 65) I have collected more evidence of the relation of Aesculapius to serpents.

a marine goddess; but he acknowledged that he could not see the image in the temple for the multitude of garlands with which it was covered, probably by worshippers who thus expressed their thanks for the revelations vouchsafed to them in sleep. The vicinity of the sea, with the solemn lullaby of its waves, might plead in favour of Ino's claim to be the patroness of the shrine. Others, however, held that she was Pasiphae in the character of the Moon; and they may have supported their opinion, before they retired at nightfall to the sacred dormitory, by pointing to the silvery orb in the sky and her shimmering reflection on the moonlit water. Be that as it may, the highest magistrates of Sparta appear to have frequented this sequestered spot for the sake of the divine counsels which they expected to receive in slumber, and it is said that at a momentous crisis of Spartan history one of them here dreamed an ominous dream.[1]

Dream oracles in ancient Italy.

Ancient Italy as well as Greece had its oracular seats, where anxious mortals sought for advice and comfort from the gods or deified men in dreams. Thus the soothsayer Calchas was worshipped at Drium in Apulia, and persons who wished to inquire of him sacrificed a black ram and slept on the skin.[2] Another ancient and revered Italian oracle was that of Faunus, and the mode of consulting him was similar. The inquirer sacrificed a sheep, spread out its skin on the ground, and sleeping on it received an answer in a dream. If the seat of the oracle was, as there is reason to think, in a sacred grove beside the cascade at Tibur, the solemn shade of the trees and the roar of the tumbling waters might well inspire the pilgrim with religious awe and mingle with his dreams.[3] The little circular shrine, which

[1] Pausanias iii. 26. 1; Plutarch, *Agis*, 9; *id.*, *Cleomenes*, 7; Cicero, *De divinatione*, i. 43. 96. As to the site of the oracle and the character of the scenery I may refer the reader to my note on Pausanias (vol. iii. p. 400). Cicero was mistaken in thinking that the shrine was near the city of Sparta. The whole rugged and lofty range of Taygetus lay between.

[2] Strabo vi. 3. 9, p. 284, ed. Casaubon.

[3] Virgil, *Aen.* vii. 81 *sqq.*, with Conington's commentary on verse 82; Ovid, *Fasti*, iv. 649 *sqq.* For more evidence of divination by dreams in antiquity, see B. Büchsenschütz, *Traum und Traumdeutung im Alterthume* (Berlin, 1868); A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1879), i. 280 *sqq.*; L. Deubner, *De Incubatione* (Leipsic, 1900).

still overhangs the waterfall, may have been the very spot where the rustic god was believed to whisper in the ears of his slumbering votaries.

§ 3. *The Heavenly Ladder*

Stories of ladders leading from earth to heaven. African tales of heavenly ladders.

Far different from these oracular seats in the fair landscapes of Greece and Italy was the desolate stony hollow among the barren hills, where Jacob slept and saw the vision of angels ascending and descending the ladder that led from earth to heaven. The belief in such a ladder, used by divine beings or the souls of the dead, meets us in other parts of the world. Thus, speaking of the gods of West Africa, Miss Kingsley tells us that "in almost all the series of native traditions there, you will find accounts of a time when there was direct intercourse between the gods or spirits that live in the sky, and men. That intercourse is always said to have been cut off by some human error; for example, the Fernando Po people say that once upon a time there was no trouble or serious disturbance upon earth because there was a ladder, made like the one you get palm-nuts with, 'only long, long'; and this ladder reached from earth to heaven so the gods could go up and down it and attend personally to mundane affairs. But one day a cripple boy started to go up the ladder, and he had got a long way up when his mother saw him, and went up in pursuit. The gods, horrified at the prospect of having boys and women invading heaven, threw down the ladder, and have since left humanity severely alone." [1]

Toradja tales of creepers that led from earth to heaven.

The Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes say that in the olden time, when all men lived together, sky and earth were connected with each other by a creeper. One day a handsome young man, of celestial origin, whom they call Mr. Sun (*Lasaeo*), appeared on earth, riding a white buffalo. He found a girl at work in the fields, and falling in love with the damsel he took her to wife. They lived together for a time, and Mr. Sun taught people to till the ground and supplied them with buffaloes. But one day it chanced that the child, which Mr.

[1] Mary H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa* (London, 1897), p. 507.

Sun had by his wife, misbehaved in the house and so offended his father that, in disgust at mankind, he returned to heaven by the creeper. His wife attempted to clamber up it after him, but he cut the creeper through, so that it and his wife together fell down to earth and were turned to stone. They may be seen to this day in the form of a limestone hill not far from the river Wimbi. The hill is shaped like a coil of rope and bears the name of the Creeper Hill (*Tamoengkoe mBaloegai*).[1] Further, in Toradja stories we hear of a certain Rolled-up Rattan, by which mortals can ascend from earth to heaven. It is a thorny creeper growing about a fig-tree and adding every year a fresh coil round the bole. Any person who would use it must first waken it from sleep by shattering seven cudgels on its tough fibres. That rouses the creeper from its slumber; it shakes itself, takes a betel-nut, and asks the person what he wants. When he begs to be carried up to the sky, the creeper directs him to seat himself either on its thorns or on its upper end, taking with him seven bamboo vessels full of water to serve as ballast. As the creeper rises in the air, it heels over to right or left, whereupon the passenger pours out some water, and the creeper rights itself accordingly. Arrived at the vault of heaven, the creeper shoots through a hole in the firmament, and, grappling fast by its thorns to the celestial floor, waits patiently till the passenger has done his business up aloft and is ready to return to earth. In this way the hero of the tale makes his way to the upper regions and executes his purpose there, whatever it is, whether it be to recover a stolen necklace, to storm and pillage a heavenly village, or to have a dead man restored to life by the heavenly smith.[2]

Stories of a heaven-reaching rock, cable, scarf, and ladder in Sumatra, Madagascar, and Russia.

The Battas or Bataks of Sumatra say that at the middle of the earth there was formerly a rock, of which the top reached up to heaven, and by which certain privileged beings, such as heroes and priests, could mount up to the sky. In heaven there grew a great fig-tree (*waringin*) which

[1] N. Adriani en A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (The Hague, 1912–1914), i. 23 *sq.*, 273.

[2] N. Adriani en A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes*, iii. 396 *sq.*, 433 *sq.*, 436 *sq.*, 440.

sent down its roots to meet the rock, thus enabling mortals to swarm up it to the mansions on high. But one day a man out of spite cut down the tree, or perhaps rather severed its roots, because his wife, who had come down from heaven, returned thither and left him forlorn.[1] The Betsimisaraka of Madagascar think that the souls of the dead ascend to the sky by climbing up a silver cable, by which also celestial spirits come and go on their missions to earth.[2] According to the Cheremiss of Russia, in the beginning of things men knew not God, who dwelt apart in his heavenly house. He had a beautiful daughter, but no servant, so he had to work hard for his living, and his daughter kept his flocks and herds. However, grass did not grow in heaven; hence God was obliged to send his flocks and herds down to earth to pasture, and his daughter accompanied them in the capacity of shepherdess or herd-girl. For that purpose God opened the gate of heaven and let down a long scarf of felt; his daughter slid down it, and on reaching the earth called out, "*Dokh, dokh, dokh!*" whereupon the horses slid down the scarf after her. In like manner she called the cows and the sheep, and they also slid down the scarf to earth. When the evening was come, she would cry, "Father, let down the scarf; I must return home." So God opened the gate of heaven and let down the scarf, and the shepherdess, followed by her flocks, ascended by it to the sky. But one day, when she had come down to earth, she saw a young man and gave him her handkerchief and her hand. For two years they hid their marriage from her divine father, but at last they acknowledged it to him. God celebrated the wedding with a grand feast and gave his daughter a handsome dowry. Since that time men have known God; but what has become of the scarf, which used to serve as a ladder between heaven and earth, the story does not relate.[3] Again, "a Mazovian

[1] W. Ködding, "Die batakschen Götter und ihr Verhältnis zum Brahmanismus," *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*, xii. (1885), p. 404; Alb. C. Kruijt, *Het Animisme in den Indischen Archipel* (The Hague, 1906), pp. 494 *sq.* The former of these writers does not mention the fig-tree.

[2] A. et G. Grandidier, "De la religion des Malgaches," *L'Anthropologie*, xxviii. (1917) p. 111.

[3] J. N. Smirnov, *Les Populations Finnoises des Bassins de la Volga et de la Kama*, Première Partie (Paris, 1898), p. 202.

legend tells how a certain pilgrim, on his way to worship at the Holy Sepulchre, became lost in a rocky place from which he could not for a long time extricate himself. At last he saw hanging in the air a ladder made of birds' feathers. Up this he clambered for three months, at the end of which he reached the Garden of Paradise, and entered among groves of gold and silver and gem-bearing trees, all of which were familiar with the past, the present, and the future."[1]

Ladders to facilitate the descent of gods or spirits to earth.

Different from these imaginary ladders are the real ladders which some people set up to facilitate the descent of gods or spirits from heaven to earth. For example, the natives of Timorlaut, Babar, and the Leti Islands in the Indian Archipelago worship the sun as the chief male god, who fertilizes the earth, regarded as a goddess, every year at the beginning of the rainy season. For this beneficent purpose the deity descends into a sacred fig-tree (*waringin*), and to enable him to alight on the ground the people place under the tree a ladder with seven rungs, the rails of which are decorated with the carved figures of two cocks, as if to announce the arrival of the god of day by their shrill clarion.[2] When the Toradjas of Central Celebes are offering sacrifices to the gods at the dedication of a new house, they set up two stalks of plants, adorned with seven strips of white cotton or barkcloth, to serve the gods as ladders whereby they may descend to partake of the rice, tobacco, betel, and palm-wine provided for them.[3] Among the Dyaks of Dusun, in Southern Borneo, when a medicine-man is called into a house to heal a sick person, an altar with offerings is set up in the middle of the room, and from it a light ladder, made of reeds, is stretched to the ridge of the roof. In response to an invocation the spirits alight on the roof, and descending the ladder enter into the medicine-man, who, thus possessed

[1] W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*, Second Edition (London, 1872), p. 111.

[2] G. W. W. C. Baron van Hoëvell, "Einige weitere Notizen über die Formen der Götterverehrung auf den Süd-wester und Süd-oster Inseln," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, viii. (1895) p. 134. For more details as to this ceremony of the annual fertilization of the earth by the sun, see *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, ii. 98 *sq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part i.).

[3] N. Adriani en A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), ii. 163.

by them, dances wildly about and then sucks the sickness out of the patient's body.[1]

Ladders in graves for the souls of the dead to climb up.

Again, some peoples both in ancient and modern times have imagined that the souls of the dead pass up from earth to heaven by means of a ladder, and they have even placed miniature ladders in the graves in order to enable the ghosts to swarm up them to the abode of bliss. Thus in the Pyramid Texts, which are amongst the oldest literature of the world, mention is often made of the ladder up which dead Egyptian kings climbed to the sky. Generally this celestial ladder appears to be made by the Sun-god, Ra or Atum. Thus we read that "Atum has done that which he said he would do for this king Pepi II., binding for him the rope-ladder, joining together the (wooden) ladder for this king Pepi II.; (thus) this king is far from the abomination of men." Or it is the four sons of Horus who "bind a rope-ladder for this king Pepi II.; they join together a (wooden) ladder for king Pepi II. They send up king Pepi II. to Khepri (the Sun-god) that he may arrive on the east side of the sky. Its timbers are hewn by Shesa, the ropes that are in it are joined together with cords of Gasuti, the Bull of the Sky (Saturn); the uprights at its sides are fastened with leather."[2] Again, the dead man is told that Ra and Horus set up a ladder for him: "One of them stands on this side and the other on that side: thou ascendest on it up to heaven. The gate of heaven is opened for thee, and the great bolts are withdrawn for thee. There wilt thou find Ra standing; he will take thee by the hand and lead thee into the sanctuary (?) of heaven, and will set thee on the throne of Osiris, on that throne of thine that thou mayest rule over the Blessed."[3] In many Egyptian graves there has been found a ladder, which may have been intended to enable the ghost to scramble up out of the grave, perhaps even to ascend up to heaven, like the kings of old.[4]

Soul-ladders in ancient Egypt.

The Mangars, a fighting tribe of Nepaul, are careful to

[1] P. te Wechel, "Erinnerungen aus den Ost- und West-Dusun-ländern (Borneo)," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xxii. (1915) pp. 45 *sq.*

[2] J. H. Breastead, *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1912), pp. 111 *sq.*, compare pp. 153 *sq.*

[3] A. Erman, *Die ägyptische Religion*[2] (Berlin, 1909), p. 112.

[4] A. Erman, *op. cit.* pp. 210 *sq.*

provide their dead with ladders up which they may climb to the celestial mansions. "Two bits of wood, about three feet long, are set up on either side of the grave. In the one are cut nine steps or notches forming a ladder for the spirit of the dead to ascend to heaven; on the other every one present at the funeral cuts a notch to show that he has been there. As the maternal uncle steps out of the grave, he bids a solemn farewell to the dead and calls upon him to ascend to heaven by the ladder that stands ready for him." However, lest the ghost should decline to avail himself of this opportunity of scaling the heights of heaven, and should prefer to return to his familiar home, the mourners are careful to barricade the road against him with thorn bushes.[1] Soul-ladders in Nepaul.

It is, or used to be, a popular belief in Russia, that "the soul had to rise from the grave, and therefore certain aids to climbing were buried with the corpse. Among these were plaited thongs of leather and small ladders. One of the most interesting specimens of survival to be found among the customs of the Russian peasantry is connected with this idea. Even at the present day, when many of them have forgotten the origin of the custom, they still, in some districts, make little ladders of dough, and have them baked for the benefit of the dead. In the Government of Voroneje a ladder of this sort, about three feet high, is set up at the time when a coffin is being carried to the grave; in some other places similar pieces of dough are baked in behalf of departed relatives on the fortieth day after their death, or long pies marked crosswise with bars are taken to church on Ascension Day and divided between the priest and the poor. In some villages these pies, which are known as *Lyesenki* or 'ladderlings,' have seven bars or rungs, in reference to the Seven Heavens. The peasants fling them down from the belfry, and accept their condition after their fall as an omen of their own probable fate after death."[2] From the Russians the belief and the custom have been borrowed by the Cheremiss. They imagine that the abode of bliss is Soul-ladders in Russian graves.

[1] (Sir) H. H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1891), ii. 75.

[2] W. R. S. Ralston, *The Songs of the Russian People*[2] (London, 1872), pp. 110 *sq.*

Soul-ladders among the Cheremiss of Russia and some tribes of the Malay Peninsula.

somewhere up aloft, and to enable a dead man to mount up to it, they obligingly place a small ladder in the coffin or supply him with the article on the fortieth day after burial.[1] The Besisi and Jakun, two pagan tribes of the Malay Peninsula, provide their dead with soul-ladders (*tangga sĕmangat*), which are plain upright or inclined sticks, whereby the soul of the deceased can leave the grave at pleasure.[2]

§ 4. *The Sacred Stone*

Popularity of the sanctuary at Bethel in later times.

In spite of its dreary and inhospitable surroundings, Bethel became in later times the most popular sanctuary of the northern kingdom.[3] Jeroboam instituted there the worship of one of the two golden calves which he had made to be the gods of Israel; he built an altar and created a priesthood.[4] In the age of the prophet Amos the sanctuary was under the special patronage of the king and was regarded as a royal chapel;[5] it was thronged with worshippers;[6] the altars were multiplied;[7] the ritual was elaborate;[8] the expenses of maintenance were met by the tithes levied at the shrine;[9] the summer and winter houses of the noble and wealthy in the neighbourhood were numerous and luxurious.[10] To account for the odour of sanctity which, from time immemorial, had hung round this naturally desolate and uninviting spot and had gradually invested it with all this splendour and refinement of luxury, the old story of Jacob and his dream was told to the worshippers. As often as they paid their tithes to the priests, they understood that they were fulfilling the vow made long ago by the patriarch when, waking in fright from his troubled sleep in the circle of stones, he promised to give to God a tenth of all that the deity should give to him.[11] And the

[1] P. v. Stenin, "Ein neuer Beitrag zur Ethnographie der Tscheremissen," *Globus*, lviii. (1890) p. 202; J. N. Smirnov, *Les Populations Finnoises des Bassins de la Volga et de la Kama*, Première Partie (Paris, 1898), p. 141.

[2] W. W. Skeat and C. O. Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula* (London, 1906), ii. 108, 114.

[3] See S. R. Driver's note on Amos ii. 14 (*Joel and Amos*, Cambridge, 1901, p. 162, *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*).

[4] 1 Kings xii. 28-33.

[5] Amos vii. 13.

[6] Amos ix. 1.

[7] Amos iii. 14.

[8] Amos iv. 4, 5.

[9] Amos iv. 4.

[10] Amos v. 4.

[11] Genesis xxviii. 22.

great standing-stone or pillar, which doubtless stood beside the principal altar, was believed to be the very stone on which the wanderer had laid his weary head that memorable night, and which he had set up next morning as a monument of his dream. For such sacred stones or monoliths were regular features of Canaanite and Hebrew sanctuaries in days of old; many of them have been discovered in their original positions by the excavators who have laid bare these ancient "high places" in modern times.[1] Even the prophet Hosea appears to have regarded a standing-stone or pillar as an indispensable adjunct of a holy place dedicated to the worship of Jehovah.[2] It was only in later times that the progressive spirit of Israelitish religion condemned these rude stone monuments as heathenish, decreed their destruction, and forbade their erection.[3] Originally the deity seems to have been conceived as actually resident in the stones; it was his awful presence which conferred on them their sanctity. Hence Jacob declared that the stone which he erected at Bethel should be God's house.[4]

Sacred stones at Canaanite and Hebrew sanctuaries.

The idea of a stone tenanted by a god or other powerful spirit was not peculiar to ancient Israel; it has been shared by many peoples in many lands. The Arabs in antiquity worshipped stones,[5] and even under Islam the Black Stone at Mecca continues to occupy a principal place in their devotions at the central shrine of their religion.[6] As commonly understood, the prophet Isaiah, or the later writer who passed under his name, denounced the idolatrous Israelites who worshipped the smooth, water-worn boulders in the dry rocky gullies, pouring libations and making offerings to them.[7] We are told that in the

Stones worshipped by the ancient Arabs and Greeks.

[1] G. F. Moore, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, ii. coll. 2974 *sqq.*; J. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*[2] (Tübingen, 1907), pp. 42 *sq.*, 321 *sqq.*; S. R. Driver, *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible, The Schweich Lectures, 1908* (London, 1909), pp. 62-65; H. Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'Exploration récente* (Paris, 1914), pp. 102 *sqq.*

[2] Hosea iii. 4, x. 1.

[3] Exodus xxiii. 24, xxxiv. 13; Leviticus xxvi. 1; Deuteronomy vii. 5, xvi. 22.

[4] Genesis xxviii. 22.

[5] Clement of Alexandria, *Protrept.* iv. 1, p. 40, ed. Potter.

[6] (Sir) E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*[2] (London, 1873), ii. 166.

[7] Isaiah lvii. 6. However, this interpretation, though probable, is not free from doubt, since the ordinary word for "stones" is absent from the Hebrew text. See the commentaries of Aug. Dillmann (*Der Prophet Jesaia*,[5] Leipsic, 1890, p. 486), Principal J. Skinner (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*), and O. C. Whitehouse (*The Century Bible*) on the passage.

olden time all the Greeks worshipped unwrought stones instead of images. In the market-place of Pharae, in Achaia, there were thirty square stones, to each of which the people gave the name of a god.[1] At Megara there was a stone in the shape of a pyramid, which was called Apollo Carinus;[2] on coins of the city it is represented as an obelisk standing between two dolphins.[3] Near Gythium in Laconia there was an unwrought stone which went by the name of Zeus Cappotas; legend ran that the matricide Orestes had been cured of his madness by sitting on it.[4] In a temple of Hercules at Olmones in Boeotia the god was represented, not by an image, but in the old fashion by an unwrought stone.[5] The inhabitants of Thespiae, in Boeotia, honoured Love above all the gods; and the great sculptors Lysippus and Praxiteles wrought for the city glorious images of the amorous deity in bronze and marble. Yet beside these works of refined Greek art the people paid their devotions to an uncouth idol of the god in the shape of a rough stone.[6] The Aenianes of Thessaly worshipped a stone, sacrificing to it and covering it with the fat of victims. They explained its sanctity by a story, that in days of old one of their kings had slain another king in single combat by hurling this stone at him.[7]

Worship of stones in Melanesia. Sacred stones in the Banks' Islands and New Hebrides.

The worship of rude stones has been practised all over the world, nowhere perhaps more systematically than in Melanesia. Thus, for example, in the Banks' Islands and the Northern New Hebrides the spirits to whom food is offered are almost always connected with stones on which the offerings are made. Certain of these stones have been sacred to some spirit from ancient times, and the knowledge of the proper way of propitiating the spirit has been handed down, generation after generation, to the particular man who is now the fortunate possessor of it. "But any man may find a stone for himself, the shape of which strikes his fancy, or some other object, an octopus in his hole, a shark, a snake, an eel, which seems to him something unusual, and

[1] Pausanias vii. 22. 4.
[2] Pausanias i. 44. 2.
[3] F. Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner, *Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*, p. 6, with plate A viii.
[4] Pausanias iii. 22. 1.
[5] Pausanias ix. 24. 3.
[6] Pausanias ix. 27. 1-3.
[7] Plutarch, *Quaestiones Graecae*, 13.

therefore connected with a spirit. He gets money and scatters it about the stone, or on the place where he has seen the object of his fancy; then he goes home to sleep. He dreams that some one takes him to a place and shews him the pigs or money he is to have because of his connexion with the thing that he has found. This thing in the Banks' Islands becomes his *tano-oloolo*, the place of his offering, the object in regard to which offering is made to get pigs or money. His neighbours begin to know that he has it, and that his increasing wealth has its origin there; they come to him, therefore, and obtain through him the good offices of the spirit he has come to know. He hands down the knowledge of this to his son or nephew. If a man is sick he gives another who is known to have a stone of power—the spirit connected with which it is suggested that he has offended—a short string of money, and a bit of the pepper root, *gea*, that is used for kava; the sick man is said to *oloolo* to the possessor of the stone. The latter takes the things offered to his sacred place and throws them down, saying, 'Let So-and-So recover.' When the sick man recovers he pays a fee. If a man desires to get the benefit of the stone, or whatever it is, known to another, with a view to increase of money, pigs, or food, or success in fighting, the possessor of the stone will take him to his sacred place, where probably there are many stones, each good for its own purpose. The applicant will supply money, perhaps a hundred strings a few inches long. The introducer will shew him one stone and say, 'This is a big yam,' and the worshipper puts money down. Of another he says it is a boar, of another that it is a pig with tusks, and money is put down. The notion is that the spirit, *vui*, attached to the stone likes the money, which is allowed to remain upon or by the stone. In case the *oloolo*, the sacrifice, succeeds, the man benefited pays the man to whom the stones and spirits belong."[1]

A Melanesian Bethel.

From this instructive account we learn that in these islands a regular sanctuary may originate in the fancy of a man who, having noticed a peculiar-looking stone and dreamed about it, concludes that the stone must contain a powerful spirit, who can help him, and whom he and his

[1] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (Oxford, 1891), pp. 140 *sq.*

descendants henceforth propitiate with offerings. Further, we see how such a sanctuary, as it rises in reputation, may attract more and more worshippers, and so grow wealthy through the offerings which the gratitude or the cupidity of the devotees may lead them to deposit at the shrine. Have we not here a Melanesian counterpart of the history of Bethel? An older mode of interpretation might see in it a diabolical counterfeit of a divine original.

Worship of stones in Aneityum.

Again, speaking of the natives of Aneityum, one of the Southern New Hebrides, Dr. George Turner tells us that "smooth stones apparently picked up out of the bed of the river were regarded as representatives of certain gods, and wherever the stone was, there the god was supposed to be. One resembling a fish would be prayed to as the fisherman's god. Another, resembling a yam, would be the yam god. A third, round like a bread-fruit, the bread-fruit god, and so on."[1] Similarly, referring to the same island, another missionary writes, "Many *Natmases* or spirits were worshipped; these were appealed to and propitiated by small offerings of food, hung in small baskets on the branches of trees, or laid on the top of sacred stones, where certain of these spirits were supposed to have their habitation."[2]

Worship of stones in Futuna.

Again, describing the religion of Futuna, an island of the New Hebrides, another missionary writes, "Some gods worshipped by the natives inhabited trees and stones, and thus their religion descended to fetishism. Further, they possessed sacred or magical stones, to make the fruits of the earth grow. The stones resembled in form the yams, or fruits, over which their magic influence was used. The stones for causing bread-fruit to grow were almost exactly like the fruit; but in others the resemblance between the stones and the objects represented was fanciful. These stones were very numerous, and common people as well as chiefs possessed them. Some were used for catching fish; others were love-charms to help the possessor in obtaining a wife or

[1] George Turner, *Samoa* (London, 1884), p. 327. These "smooth stones apparently picked up out of the bed of the river" answer to the similar stones worshipped by the Israelites. See above, p. 59.

[2] Rev. J. Lawrie, "Aneityum, New Hebrides," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Hobart, Tasmania, in January 1892* (Sydney), p. 712.

husband; others were used in war to give a steady aim in throwing the spear, or in warding off blows of enemies. The sorcerers used them in making disease, and the sacred men in causing drought, hurricanes, rain, etc." [1]

Worship of stones in the Torres Straits Islands.

The natives of the Torres Straits Islands used to worship round painted stones, which they believed could help them in fishing or procure them a fair wind, and so forth.[2] For example, some of these stones were supposed to give success in turtle-fishing; accordingly their assistance was invoked and offerings made to them. Live turtles were often buried beside these stones, their heads only projecting from the earth and their flappers tied securely to prevent their escape. A Christian native who stole, or rather released, two such votive turtles for the purpose of consecrating them to the pot, excited the rage of the islanders, who predicted the speedy death of the impious thief.[3] Again, in the island of Tauan there used to be a large, perfectly round stone, painted red, which could give success in hunting dugong, the large marine mammal, something like a porpoise, with a pig's head and a horse's mouth, which abounds in these seas. The stone was supposed to represent a dugong, and a white streak encircling it stood for the rope with which the dugong-hunter hoped to bind his prey. When a man resolved to go dugong-hunting, he used to present an offering of fish and coco-nuts to the stone, and in approaching it he mimicked the paddling of a canoe. Then coming near, he would rush at the stone and clasp it in his arms, all the while uttering a prayer for success. The firmer he gripped the mock dugong, the surer he was to catch a real one.[4] In this ceremony elements of religion and magic are clearly combined. The prayer and offering to the stone are purely religious, being apparently intended to propitiate a spirit resident in the stone. On the other hand the simulation of a dugong-hunt, by going through the actions of paddling a canoe and clasping a dugong in the arms, are pure pieces of mimetic magic designed to ensure the desired end by imitating it.

In one of the Samoan Islands the god Turia had his

[1] W. Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna* (London, 1914), pp. 221 *sq.*

[2] W. Wyatt Gill, *Life in the South-ern Isles* (London, N.D.), p. 217.

[3] W. Wyatt Gill, *op. cit.* p. 293.

[4] W. Wyatt Gill, *op. cit.* p. 302.

Worship of stones in Samoa.

shrine in a very smooth stone, which was kept in a sacred grove. The priest was careful to weed all round about, and covered the stone with branches to keep the god warm. When prayers were offered on account of war, drought, famine, or epidemic, the branches were carefully renewed. Nobody dared to touch the stone, lest a poisonous and deadly influence should radiate from it on the transgressor.[1] In another Samoan village two oblong smooth stones, standing on a platform, were believed to be the parents of Saato, a god who controlled the rain. When the chiefs and people were ready to go off for weeks to the bush for the sport of pigeon-catching, they laid offerings of cooked taro and fish on the stones, accompanying them with prayers for fine weather and no rain. Any one who refused an offering to the stones was frowned upon; and if rain fell, he was blamed and punished for bringing down the wrath of the fine-weather god and spoiling the sport of the season. Moreover, in time of scarcity, when people were on their way to search for wild yams, they would give a yam to the two stones as a thank-offering, supposing that these gods caused the yams to grow, and that they could lead them to the best places for finding such edible roots. Any person casually passing by with a basket of food would also stop and lay a morsel on the stones. When such offerings were eaten in the night by dogs or rats, the people thought that the god became temporarily incarnate in these animals in order to consume the victuals.[2]

Worship of stones in Bowditch Island and Nukunau.

In Fakaofo, or Bowditch Island, South Pacific, the great native god was called Tui Tokelau, or king of Tokelau. He was thought to be embodied in a stone, which was kept carefully wrapt up in fine mats, and never seen by any one but the king, and that only once a year, when the decayed mats were stripped off and thrown away. In time of sickness fine mats were brought as offerings and rolled round the sacred stone, which thus became busked up to a prodigious size; but as the idol stood exposed to the weather under the open sky, the mats soon rotted. No one dared to appropriate what had been offered to the god; so the old mats, as they were taken off, were heaped in a place by themselves and left to decay.

[1] G. Turner, *Samoa* (London, 1884), p. 62.
[2] G. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 24 *sq.*

Once a year, about the month of May, a great festival was held there in honour of the god. It lasted a whole month. All work was laid aside. The people assembled from the islands of the group and feasted and danced, praying for life, health, and a plentiful supply of coco-nuts.[1] In Nikunau, an island of the Gilbert Group in the South Pacific, the gods and goddesses were represented by sandstone slabs or pillars. If the stone slab represented a goddess it was not set up erect, but laid down on the ground, the natives thinking that it would be cruel to make the divine lady stand so long.[2]

Worship of stones in the Indian Archipelago.

The natives of Timor, an island of the Indian Archipelago, are much concerned about earth-spirits, which dwell in rocks and stones of unusual and striking shape. Not all such rocks and stones, however, are haunted, and when a man has found one of them he must dream upon it, in order to ascertain whether a spirit dwells in it or not. If in his dream the spirit appears to him and demands a sacrifice of man, or beast, or betel, he has the stone removed and set up near his house. Such stones are worshipped by whole families or villages and even districts. The spirit who resides in the stone cares for the welfare of the people, and requires to receive in return betel and rice, but sometimes also fowls, pigs, and buffaloes. Beside the stone there often stand pointed stakes, on which hang the skulls of slain foes.[3] The Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes tell of a time when all their tribes dwelt together about Lake Posso. At last under the leadership of six brothers and a sister they broke up into seven bands and parted. But before they separated they set up seven stones, called the Stones of Parting, of which three are standing to this day. When a Toradja passes the stones, he strews yellow-dyed rice on them, invokes his forefathers, and begs them to give him rice and fish.[4] The Dyaks of Dusun, in the south of Borneo, believe that the souls of dead ancestors sometimes lodge in certain stones. A man will dream that the ghost of a departed kinsman has appeared to him, and on awaking

[1] G. Turner, *Samoa*, pp. 268 *sq.*

[2] G. Turner, *Samoa*, p. 296.

[3] J. Wanner, "Ethnologische Notizen über die Inseln Timor und Misol," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.F. xii. (1913) pp. 153 *sq.*

[4] N. Adriani en A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 5.

he will engage a sorcerer to discover the stone in which the spirit resides. When the stone has been found, it is carefully preserved and sacrifices are regularly offered to it.[1]

Worship of stones among the Karens of Burma.

In Burma "all the Karens, but especially the wilder Bghai tribes, hold certain stones in great reverence as possessing superhuman powers. I do not know exactly what spirits are supposed to dwell in them, but rather fancy they are regarded more as amulets or magic stones than as gods. Yet sacrifices of hogs and fowls are offered, and the blood poured on the stones. These stones have the wonderful property of always returning to the owner if lost or taken away. They are generally private property, though in some villages there are stones so sacred and powerful that none but certain of the wisest elders dare look on them. These stones are generally pieces of rock-crystal, or curiously stratified rock; anything that strikes the poor ignorant Karen as uncommon is regarded as necessarily possessing occult powers." [2]

Sacred stone of the Semas in Assam.

The worship of stones appears to be common among the Naga tribes of Assam.[3] For instance, on a ridge near the Sema village of Champini, there may be seen a large solitary stone, about nine feet long by two feet wide; one end of the stone is split off and lies close by. The place is surrounded by a circle of trees. The stone is the god Puzzi, but he is dead, because Tukko, the god of the Angamis, a neighbouring hill tribe, came and fought him, knocked him down, and cut his head off. One of the god's ears, too, was severed from his head, and lies in the valley below, where the natives point it out to strangers. Long ago, they say, before the English came to the hills, Puzzi was not broken, but stood erect, and so bright and shining was he, that nobody could approach him within many paces. Yet though Puzzi is unfortunately dead, the spot where his body lies is still hallowed ground, and is kept free of weeds and undergrowth. When the villagers make

[1] P. te Wechel, "Erinnerungen aus den Ost- und West-Dusun-ländern (Borneo)," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xxii. (1915) p. 19.

[2] Capt. C. J. F. S. Forbes, *British Burma and its People* (London, 1878), p. 295.

[3] W. H. Furness, "The Ethnography of the Nagas of Eastern Assam," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii. (1902) pp. 457 *sqq.*

their clearings for rice-fields in front of Puzzi's corpse, they sacrifice a fowl, and from its entrails they read the omens for the harvest. The body of the fowl may not be eaten, but must be hung on one of the neighbouring trees, and some of its feathers tied to stakes near Puzzi's head.[1]

Worship of stones in India.

There is hardly a village in Northern India which has not its sacred stone. Very often the stone is not appropriated to any one deity in particular, but represents the aggregate of the local divinities who have the affairs of the community under their charge.[2] In Chhattisgar, for example, a division of the Central Provinces, the village god, Thakur Deo, is represented by a collection of oddly shaped stones, which usually lie on a platform under a shady tree. In the Drug subdivision the sacred stones are shaped like two-legged stools. Every village worships Thakur Deo twice a year, in the months of Paus and Chaitra, and on these occasions they sacrifice goats and fowls to him and have a feast.[3] Among the tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, "in every village in which Shins are in the majority, there is a large stone which is still more or less the object of reverence. Each village has its own name for this stone, but an oath taken or an engagement made over it, is often held more binding than where the Koran is used. In several villages goats are still annually sacrificed beside the stone, which is sprinkled with blood, and in other places the practice has only lately been discontinued."[4]

The Miao-kia of Southern China revere certain natural

[1] W. H. Furness, "The Ethnography of the Nagas of Eastern Assam," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii. (1902) pp. 458 *sq.* As to the Semas, who worship this stone, Sir E. A. Gait tells us that they are "the most barbarous and savage tribes with which we have yet come into contact in these hills. But four years ago the custom of head-taking was in full swing amongst all the villages to the east of the Doyang river, and the use of money was unknown to almost every village of the tribe." See *Census of India, 1891, Assam*, vol. i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Shillong, 1892), p. 247.

[2] W. Crooke, *The Popular Religion and Folk-lore of Northern India* (Westminster, 1896), ii. 163 *sq.*

[3] P. N. Bose, "Chhattisgar: notes on its tribes, sects and castes," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lix. Part i. (Calcutta, 1891), p. 275. The village god Thakur Deo seems to be specially concerned with cultivation. The Baigas and Bhainas worship him before they sow their crops; on these occasions the village priest sows a few seeds in the earth before Thakur Deo, who among the Baigas lives in a tree instead of a stone. See R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), ii. 85, 231.

[4] Major J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (Calcutta, 1880), pp. 114 *sq.*

Worship of stones among the Miao-kia of China and the Ingouch of the Caucasus.

stones of more or less geometrical shape. These they enclose in little wooden shrines roofed with tiles or thatch, and from time to time they offer sacrifices before them. Like the Chinese, they also burn sticks of incense before oddly shaped rocks or boulders.[1] The Ingouch tribe of the Caucasus regard certain rocks as sacred and offer costly sacrifices to them, especially at funerals. And if an Ingouch is alleged to owe money to a Tchetchense, and cannot or will not pay it, he may be compelled to deny his debt on oath in presence of the sacred rock. For this purpose the bones and dung of dogs are mixed up together, and the mixture having been carried before the holy rock, the two parties take their stand at the same place, and the debtor says aloud, "If I am not speaking the truth, I consent to the dead of my family carrying on their backs the dead of So and So's family, on this very road, after the rain shall have fallen and the sun shall have shone thereupon."[2] Here the sacred rock seems to be regarded as a witness who will ensure the fulfilment of the oath or avenge its breach. Other examples of the use of stones in swearing solemn oaths will be given later on.[3]

Sacred stones in Madagascar and Africa.

Among the tribes of northern and eastern Madagascar, who bury their dead in deep woods or desert places, far from the abodes of man, it is customary to erect stones by the wayside in memory of the illustrious or the wealthy departed. Some of these stones measure from sixteen to nearly twenty feet in height. They serve as altars on which offerings to the shades are deposited, and before which people address their prayers to the spirits on solemn occasion.[4] The king of Karagwe, in Central Africa, to the west of Lake Victoria Nyanza, used to set beer and grain before a large stone on the hillside, hoping to be favoured with better crops for doing so, although in conversation with Speke he admitted that the stone could not eat the food or indeed make any use of it.[5] In Busoga, a district of Central Africa, to the north of

[1] *La Mission Lyonnaise d'Exploration Commerciale en Chine* (Lyons, 1898), p. 361.

[2] Potocki, *Voyage dans les Steps d'Astrakhan et du Caucase* (Paris, 1829), i. 124, 126.

[3] See below, pp. 405 *sqq.*

[4] A. et G. Grandidier, "De la religion des Malgaches," *L'Anthropologie*, xxviii. (1917) p. 120.

[5] J. H. Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile* (London, 1912), ch. viii. p. 197 (*Everyman's Library*).

Lake Victoria Nyanza, "each piece of rock and large stone is said to have its spirit, which is always active in a district either for good or for evil. Various kinds of diseases, especially plague, are attributed to the malevolence of rock-spirits. When sickness or plague breaks out, the spirit invariably takes possession of some person of the place, either a man or a woman; and, under the influence of the spirit, the person mounts the rock and calls from it to the people. The chief and the medicine-men assemble the people, make an offering of a goat or a fowl to the spirit, and are then told how to act in order to stay the disease. After making known its wishes to the people, the spirit leaves the person and returns to the rock, and the medium goes home to his or her ordinary pursuits and may possibly never be used again by the spirit."[1] Hence there are many sacred rocks and stones in Busoga. They are described as local deities; and to them the people go under all manner of circumstances to pray for help.[2] The Menkieras of the French Sudan, to the south of the Niger, offer sacrifices to rocks and stones. For example, at Sapo the village chief owns a great stone at the door of his house. Any man who cannot procure a wife, or whose wife is childless, will offer a fowl to the stone, hoping that the stone will provide him with a wife or child. He hands over the bird to the chief, who sacrifices and eats it. If his wishes are granted, the man will present another fowl to the stone as a thank-offering.[3]

Worship of rocks among the Hurons of Canada.

The Huron Indians of Canada worshipped certain rocks, to which they offered tobacco. Of these the most celebrated was one called Tsanhohi Arasta, that is, the abode of Tsanhohi, which was a kind of bird of prey. It seems to have stood on the bank of a river, perhaps the St. Lawrence, down which the Indians paddled on their way to Quebec. They told marvellous stories of this rock. They said it had once been a man, and they fancied they could still distinguish his head, arms, and body. Yet the rock was so huge that the arrows which they shot at it could not rise to the top. The Hurons thought that in the hollow of the

[1] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 250.

[2] J. Roscoe, *op. cit.* p. 251.

[3] Louis Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), p. 105.

great crag there dwelt a demon, who could make their voyage prosperous. So in passing they used to stop paddling and offer him tobacco, depositing it in one of the clefts of the rock, and praying, "O demon, who dost inhabit this place, here is some tobacco which I offer to you. Help us, save us from shipwreck, defend us from our enemies, cause us to do good business and to return safe and sound to our village."[1] The great oracle of the Mandan Indians was a thick porous stone some twenty feet in circumference, whose miraculous utterances were believed with implicit confidence by these simple savages. Every spring, and on some occasions during the summer, a deputation waited on the holy stone and solemnly smoked to it, alternately taking a whiff themselves and then passing the pipe to the stone. That ceremony duly performed, the deputies retired to an adjoining wood for the night, while the stone was supposed to be left to his unassisted meditations. Next morning the ripe fruit of his reflections was visible in the shape of certain white marks on the stone, which some members of the deputation had the less difficulty in deciphering because they had themselves painted them there during the hours of darkness, while their credulous brethren were plunged in sleep.[2] The Minnetarees, another Indian tribe of the Missouri, revered the same or a similar oracular stone, and consulted it in like manner. The wonderful stone "is a large, naked, and insulated rock, situate in the midst of a small prairie, at the distance of about two days' journey, southwest of the village of that nation. In shape it resembles the steep roof of a house. The Minnetarees resort to it, for the purpose of propitiating their Man-ho-pa or Great Spirit, by presents, by fasting, and lamentation, during the space of from three to five days. An individual, who intends to perform this ceremony, takes some presents with him, such as a gun, horse, or strouding, and also provides a smooth skin upon which hieroglyphics may be drawn, and repairs to the rock accompanied by his friends and magi. On his arrival, he deposits the presents there, and after smoking

The oracular stone of the Mandan Indians.

The oracular stone of the Minnetarees.

[1] *Relations des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1858), i. 1636, pp. 108 *sq.*

[2] M. Lewis and W. Clark, *Travels to the Source of the Missouri River* (London, 1815), i. 224 (i. 225 *sq.*, London, 1905).

to the rock, he washes a portion of the face of it clean, and retires with his fellow-devotees to a specified distance. During the principal part of his stay, he cries aloud to his god to have pity on him; to grant him success in war and in hunting; to favour his endeavours to take prisoners, horses, and scalps from the enemy. When the appointed time for lamentation and prayer has elapsed, he returns to the rock; his presents are no longer there, and he believes them to have been accepted and carried off by the Manhopa himself. Upon the part of the rock, which he had washed, he finds certain hieroglyphics traced with white clay, of which he can generally interpret the meaning, particularly when assisted by some of the magi, who were no doubt privy to the whole transaction. These representations are supposed to relate to his future fortune, or to that of his family or nation; he copies them off with pious and scrupulous exactness upon the skin which he brought for the purpose, and returns to his home, to read from them to the people, the destiny of himself or of them. If a bear be represented, with its head directed towards the village, the approach of a war party, or the visitation of some evil, is apprehended. If, on the contrary, the tail of the bear be towards the village, nothing but good is anticipated, and they rejoice."[1] Again, we are told of the Dacota Indians that a man "will pick up a round stone, of any kind, and paint it, and go a few rods from his lodge, and clean away the grass, say from one to two feet in diameter, and there place his stone, or god, as he would term it, and make an offering of some tobacco and some feathers, and pray to the stone to deliver him from some danger that he has probably dreamed of" or imagined.[2]

Worship of stones among the Dacotas.

[1] Edwin James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains* (London, 1823), i. 252 *sq.* Compare Maximilian Prinz zu Wied, *Reise in das Innere Nord-America* (Coblenz, 1839–1841), ii. 186 *sq.* According to the Prince of Wied, who, however, wrote only from hearsay, the oracular stone of the Mandans and Minnetarees was one and the same, and the marks on it were permanent, being apparently engraved by cutting instruments; they represented the footprints of men and animals, and also dogs with sledges. Offerings of kettles, blankets, guns, knives, axes, pipes, and so forth might be seen lying beside the holy stone.

[2] Philander Prescott, "The Dacotahs or Sioux of the Upper Mississippi," in H. R. Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1853–1856), iii. 229.

The Gruagach stones of the Highlanders of Scotland.

The Highlanders of Scotland used to believe in a certain fairy called the Gruagach, sometimes regarded as male and sometimes as female, who looked after the herds and kept them from the rocks, haunting the fields where the cattle were at pasture. A Gruagach was to be found in every gentleman's fold, and milk had to be set apart for him every evening in the hollow of a particular stone, which was kept in the byre and called the Gruagach stone. If this were not done, the cows would yield no milk, and the cream would not rise to the surface in the bowls. Some say that milk was poured into the Gruagach stone only when the people were going to or returning from the summer pastures, or when some one was passing the byre with milk. At Holm, East-Side, and Scorrybreck, near Portree in Skye, the stones on which the libations were poured may still be seen. However, these stones are perhaps to be regarded rather as the vessels from which the Gruagach lapped the milk than as the houses in which he lived. Generally he or she was conceived as a well-dressed gentleman or lady with long yellow hair.[1] In some mountain districts of Norway down to the end of the eighteenth century the peasants used to keep round stones, which they washed every Thursday evening, and, smearing them with butter or some other grease before the fire, laid them on fresh straw in the seat of honour. Moreover, at certain seasons of the year they steeped the stones in ale, believing that they would bring luck and comfort to the house.[2]

Stones anointed in Norway.

The practice of anointing sacred stones in classical antiquity.

This Norwegian custom of smearing the stones with butter reminds us of the story that Jacob poured oil on the stone which he set up to commemorate his vision at Bethel. The legend is the best proof of the sanctity of the stone,

[1] John Gregorson Campbell, *Superstitions of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1900), pp. 184-186. Compare Th. Pennant, "Tour in Scotland," in J. Pinkerton's *General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1808–1814), iii. 330 *sq.*, 553; Miss C. F. Gordon Cumming, *In the Hebrides* (London, 1883), pp. 70 *sq.*

[2] Sven Nilsson, *The Primitive Inhabitants of Scandinavia*, edited by Sir John Lubbock (London, 1868), pp. 241 *sq.* For more examples of the worship of stones see A. Bastian, "Der Steincultus in der Ethnographie," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, iii. (1868) pp. 1-18; (Sir) E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*[2] (London, 1873), ii. 161 *sqq.*; Sir John Lubbock (Lord Avebury), *Origin of Civilisation*[4] (London, 1882), pp. 301 *sqq.* Compare W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*[2] (London, 1894), pp. 201 *sqq.*

and probably points to an ancient custom of anointing the sacred stone at the sanctuary. Certainly the practice of anointing holy stones has been widespread. At Delphi, near the grave of Neoptolemus, there was a small stone on which oil was poured every day; and at every festival unspun wool was spread on it.[1] Among the ancient Greeks, according to Theophrastus, it was characteristic of the superstitious man that when he saw smooth stones at crossroads he would pour oil on them from a flask, and then falling on his knees worship them before going his way.[2] Similarly Lucian mentions a Roman named Rutillianus, who, as often as he spied an anointed or crowned stone, went down on his knees before it, and after worshipping the dumb deity remained standing in prayer beside it for a long time.[3] Elsewhere, the same sceptical writer refers scornfully to the oiled and wreathed stones which were supposed to give oracles.[4] Speaking of the blind idolatry of his heathen days, the Christian writer Arnobius says, "If ever I perceived an anointed stone, greasy with oil, I used to adore it, as if there were some indwelling power in it, I flattered it, I spoke to it, I demanded benefits from the senseless block."[5] The same custom is alluded to by other ancient authors.[6] At the present day the peasants of Kuklia in Cyprus still anoint, or anointed till lately, the great corner-stones of the ruined temple of the Paphian Aphrodite.[7] In doing so it may well be that they keep up a custom handed down from antiquity.

The practice of anointing sacred stones in India.

The Waralis, a tribe who inhabit the jungles of Northern Konkan, in the Bombay Presidency, worship Waghia, the lord of tigers, in the form of a shapeless stone smeared with red lead and clarified butter. They give him chickens and goats, break coco-nuts on his head, and pour oil on him. In return for these attentions he preserves them from tigers, gives them good crops, and keeps disease from them.[8] And generally in the Bombay Presidency, particularly in

[1] Pausanias x. 24. 6.

[2] Theophrastus, *Characteres*, recensuit H. Diels (Oxford, N.D.), xvi. 5.

[3] Lucian, *Alexander*, 30.

[4] Lucian, *Deorum concilium*, 12.

[5] Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes*, i. 39.

[6] Apuleius, *Florida*, i. 1; Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, 3.

[7] D. G. Hogarth, *A Wandering Scholar in the Levant* (London, 1896), pp. 179 *sq.*

[8] *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, vii. (1843) p. 20.

the Konkan districts, fetish stones are worshipped by the ignorant and superstitious for the purpose of averting evil or curing disease. In every village such stones are to be seen. The villagers call each of them by the name of some god or spirit, of whom they stand in great fear, believing that he has control over all demons or ghosts. When an epidemic prevails in a village people offer food, such as fowls, goats, and coco-nuts, to the fetish stones.[1] For example, at Poona there is such a sacred stone which is coloured red and oiled.[2] Among the Bedars or Baydarus of Southern India the spirits of men who die unmarried are supposed to become *Virika* or heroes, and to their memory small temples and images are erected, where offerings of cloth, rice, and the like are made to their ghosts. "If this be neglected, they appear in dreams, and threaten those who are neglectful of their duty. These temples consist of a heap or cairn of stones, in which the roof of a small cavity is supported by two or three flags; and the image is a rude shapeless stone, which is occasionally oiled, as in this country all other images are."[3] Among the Todas of the Neilgherry Hills, in Southern India, the sacred buffaloes migrate from place to place in the hills at certain seasons of the year. At the sacred dairies there are stones on which milk is poured and butter rubbed before the migration begins. For example, at Modr there are four such stones, and they are rounded and worn quite smooth, probably through the frequent repetition of the ceremony.[4]

The practice of anointing sacred stones in the Kei Islands, Madagascar, and East Africa.

In the Kei Islands, to the south-west of New Guinea, every householder keeps a black stone at the head of his sleeping-place; and when he goes out to war or on a voyage or on business, he anoints the stone with oil to secure success.[5] "Although the Malagasy have no temples they

[1] R. E. Enthoven, "Folklore of the Konkan," p. 81 (Supplement to *The Indian Antiquary*, xliv., 1915).

[2] Captain Edward Moor, "Account of an hereditary living deity," *Asiatic Researches*, vii. (London, 1803) pp. 394 *sq.*

[3] Francis Buchanan, "Journey from Madras through the countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar," in John Pinkerton's *Voyages and Travels* (London, 1808–1814), viii. 677; Edgar Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), i. 208 *sq.*

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 130 *sq.*, 139 *sq.*, 143.

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (The Hague, 1886), p. 223.

have sacred places, where certain sacrifices are offered, and which may be considered as a kind of altar. Of these, the headstones of their tombs, rude undressed slabs of blue granite or basalt, are the most prominent, being, as already mentioned, anointed with the blood and fat of the animals killed both at funerals and on other occasions, especially at the New Year's festival. In numerous places, other stones may be seen anointed in a similar way. Some of these are in the bed of streams, being thus honoured to propitiate the spirits supposed to dwell in the water or around it. Other stones are anointed by women who wish to obtain children."[1] Thus with regard to the Betsileo, a tribe in central Madagascar, we are told that "in many parts of the country are large stones, which strike the eye of every traveller, owing to the fact that they present the appearance of having been greased all over, or at any rate of having had fat or oil poured on the top. This has given rise to a belief among strangers that these stones were gods worshipped by the Betsileo. I think it can scarcely be said that they were reverenced or treated as divinities, but that they were connected with superstitious beliefs there can be no shadow of a doubt. There are two kinds of single stones in the country looked upon thus superstitiously by the people. One kind, called *vàtobétròka*, is resorted to by women who have had no children. They carry with them a little fat or oil with which they anoint the stone, at the same time apostrophising it, they promise that if they have a child, they will return and re-anoint it with more oil. These same stones are also resorted to by traders, who promise that, if their wares are sold at a good price and quickly, they will return to the stone and either anoint it with oil, or bury a piece of silver at its base. These stones are sometimes natural but curious formations, and sometimes, but more rarely, very ancient memorials of the dead."[2] At Ambatond-

[1] James Sibree, *The Great African Island, chapters on Madagascar* (London, 1880), p. 305. Compare A. et G. Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. (Paris, 1914) p. 246 (*Histoire Physique, Naturelle et Politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv.); A. et G. Grandidier, "De la Religion des Malgaches," *L'Anthropologie*, xxviii. (1917) pp. 120, 121.

[2] George A. Shaw, "The Betsileo: Religious and Social Customs," *The Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine, Reprint of the First Four Numbers* (Antananarivo, 1885), pp. 404 *sq.*

razaka, in Madagascar, there is one of these venerable stones, which gives its name to the town; for Ambatondrazaka means "The Town of the Stone of Razaka." This Razaka is said to have been a man or a woman who died long ago. The stone is partly buried in the earth, but so much of it as is visible is of oblong shape, standing about a foot above the ground, and enclosed within a rough circle of masonry. It is customary to anoint the stone with grease and oil, and to sprinkle it with the blood of sacrificial victims.[1] At a certain spot in a mountain pass, which is particularly difficult for cattle, every man of the Akamba tribe, in British East Africa, stops and anoints a particular rock with butter or fat.[2]

The anointed stone at Bethel.

In the light of these analogies it is reasonable to suppose that there was a sacred stone at Bethel, on which worshippers from time immemorial had been accustomed to pour oil, because they believed it to be in truth a "house of God" (*Beth-el*), the domicile of a divine spirit. The belief and the practice were traced to a revelation vouchsafed to the patriarch Jacob on the spot long before his descendants had multiplied and taken possession of the land. Whether the story of that revelation embodies the tradition of a real event, or was merely invented to explain the sanctity of the place in harmony with the existing practice, we have no means of deciding. Probably there were many such sacred stones or Bethels in Canaan, all of which were regarded as the abodes of powerful spirits and anointed accordingly. Certainly the name of Beth-el or God's House would seem to have been a common designation for sacred stones of a certain sort in Palestine; for in the form *baityl-os* or *baityl-ion* the Greeks adopted it from the Hebrews and applied it to stones which are described as round and black,[3] as living or animated by a soul,[4] as moving through the air and uttering oracles in a whistling voice, which a wizard was able to interpret.[5] Such

Many Bethels (*baitylia*) in Canaan.

[1] Joseph Pearse, "Ambatondrazaka: the capital of the Antishanaka Province," *The Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine, Reprint of the First Four Numbers* (Antananarivo, 1885), p. 164.

[2] J. M. Hildebrandt, "Ethnographische Notizen über Wakamba und ihre Nachbarn," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, x. (1878) p. 384.

[3] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxvii. 135.

[4] Philo of Byblus, quoted by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelii*, i. 10. 18, Βαιτύλια λίθους ἐμψύχους.

[5] Damascius, *Vita Isidori*, § 203, compare § 94.

stones were sacred to various deities, whom the Greeks called Cronus, Zeus, the Sun, and so forth.[1] However, the description of these stones suggests that as a rule they were small and portable; one of them is said to have been a perfect sphere, measuring a span in diameter, though it miraculously increased or diminished in bulk and changed in colour from whitish to purple; letters, too, were engraved on its surface and picked out in vermilion.[2] On the other hand the holy stone at Bethel was probably one of those massive standing-stones or rough pillars which the Hebrews called *masseboth*, and which, as we have seen, were regular adjuncts of Canaanite and early Israelitish sanctuaries.[3] Well-preserved specimens of these standing-stones or pillars have been recently discovered in Palestine; notably at the sanctuaries of Gezer and Taanach. In some of them holes are cut, either on the top or on the side of the pillar, perhaps to receive offerings of oil or blood.[4] Such we may suppose to have been the sacred stone which Jacob is said to have set up and anointed at Bethel, and for which his descendants probably attested their veneration in like manner for many ages.

The standing-stones (*masseboth*) of Canaanite sanctuaries.

[1] Damascius, *Vita Isidori*, § 203.

[2] Damascius, *loc. cit.* On such stones (*baitylia*) see further Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, ii. 2779 *sqq*. Some of them may have been of meteoric origin (A. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*,[2] Tübingen, 1907, p. 315).

[3] See above, p. 59.

[4] S. R. Driver, *Modern Research as illustrating the Bible, The Schweich Lectures*, 1908 (London, 1909), p. 65. The holes are differently interpreted by A. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*,[2] p. 324.

CHAPTER V

JACOB AT THE WELL

§ 1. *Watering the Flocks*

Jacob's meeting with Rachel at the well.

CHEERED by the vision of angels and by the divine promise of protection which he had received at Bethel, the patriarch went on his way and came in time to the land of the children of the East. There he met his kinsfolk; there he found his wives; and there, from being a poor homeless wanderer, he grew rich in flocks and herds. The land where these events, so momentous in the history of Jacob and his descendants, took place is not exactly defined. The historian, or rather the literary artist, is content to leave the geography vague, while at the same time he depicts the meeting of the exile with his first love in the most vivid colours. Under his pen the scene glows as intensely as it does under the brush of Raphael, who has conferred a second immortality on it in the panels of the Vatican. It is a picture not of urban but of pastoral life. The lovers met, not in the throng and bustle of the bazaar, but in the silence and peace of green pastures on the skirts of the desert, with a great expanse of sky overhead and flocks of sheep lying around, waiting patiently to be watered at the well. The very hour of the day when the meeting took place is indicated by the writer; for he tells us that it was not yet high noon, he allows us, as it were, to inhale the fresh air of a summer morning before the day had worn on to the sultry heat of a southern afternoon. What more fitting time and place could have been imagined for the first meeting of youthful lovers? Under the charm of the hour and of the scene even the hard mercenary character of Jacob melted into something like

tenderness; he forgot for once the cool calculations of gain and gave way to an impulse of love, almost of chivalry: for at sight of the fair damsel approaching with her flocks, he ran to the well and rolling away the heavy stone which blocked its mouth he watered the sheep for her. Then he kissed his cousin's pretty face and wept.[1] Did he remember his dream of angels at Bethel and find the vision come true in love's young dream? We cannot tell. Certainly for a time the selfish schemer appeared to be transformed into the impassioned lover. It was the one brief hour of poetry and romance in a prosaic and even sordid life.

The watering of flocks at wells in modern Palestine.

The immortal picture of the meeting of Jacob and Rachel at the well makes all the deeper impression on us because it is painted from the life. Such scenes may be witnessed in the East to this day. In Palestine "as the summer comes on and the weather gets hotter, the herbage becomes dry. The sheep and goats begin to need water, which is not the case while the pasture is green and succulent. The flocks are then usually watered once a day, about noon, from a stream or spring, or, if these highly prized blessings do not exist, from wells or cisterns. Many of these cisterns are out in the open country, on the site of some ancient village which has disappeared ages ago, or found dug in a long-forgotten garden or vineyard. In such cases a large stone or pile of stones is placed over the well's mouth, partly to prevent the water being stolen, and partly to keep animals from falling in. This practice dates from remotest antiquity. . . . Sometimes a huge circular block of stone, in shape resembling a giant millstone, is placed over the well. This stone has an opening in the centre large enough to admit the easy passage of a bucket filled with water. In this opening a closely-fitting pear-shaped stone, like a stopper, is inserted, so smooth and heavy that it is almost impossible to remove it with the hands alone. It is a beautiful sight to watch, as mid-day draws on, the various flocks, led by their respective shepherds, converging towards some large spring, and then patiently awaiting their turn to come at their master's bidding and quench their thirst in the cool rivulet. Throughout the

[1] Genesis xxix. 1-11.

hotter months the sheep are taken to some shady spot to rest during the middle of the day. A grove of trees, the shadow of an overhanging rock, a cave, a ruin—all are utilized for this purpose. From time immemorial the shepherds in Palestine have done this, and the practice is referred to in the words of the Bride (Cant. i. 7): 'Tell me where thou makest thy flock to rest at noon.' In the deep valleys which descend from the tableland of Moab, and those in the hills about Es Salt (Ramoth Gilead), the perennial streams are bordered with a thick grove of tamarisk, oleander, and tall reeds. Here I have often seen the shepherds bring their flocks at noon to drink, and then rest in the deep, cool shade of the bushes by the water's side. David had, no doubt, often done the same when feeding his father's sheep, and had some such scene before his mind when he penned the words: 'He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.'"[1]

Springs and wells in Palestine.

"In such a dry climate as Palestine, every spring, however small, is utilized to the utmost for irrigating gardens of fruit-trees and vegetables, and water-rights are therefore very valuable. As the springs for the most part come out on the sides of the valleys, it is easy to water a series of terraces, at different levels, from the same source, the little rivulet sometimes reaching a long distance down the valley before it is finally absorbed. At times the traveller will come suddenly on a deep glen whose brilliant green gardens and fruit-laden trees form a striking contrast to the bare hillsides around. Descending into the valley, he will find issuing from a mass of fallen rocks, gray with the storms of centuries, a little thread of water, clear and cool, which runs into a large open cistern hewn in the solid rock, or built on the side of a natural terrace, and carefully cemented all round the inside. Here, from the neighbouring village, come at morning and evening troops of laughing girls or careworn women, with their pitchers on their heads, to draw water. Here, too, in the heat of the day, come the shepherds with their thirsty flocks, the goats and sheep patiently standing waiting their turn to come, at the shepherd's bidding, and slake their thirst, or lying quietly chewing the cud in the shade

[1] C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land* (London, 1906), pp. 172 *sq.*

of the overhanging rocks or under the shadow of a leafy tree."[1]

Wells and the watering of flocks at them.

Thus the watering-place of the flocks is sometimes a cistern into which the water pours from the hills; sometimes it is a well sunk in the rock, where the water rises from a spring and is drawn to the surface in leathern buckets or earthenware pitchers suspended from a rope. The sides of the wells are faced with masonry to a considerable depth, and the stones are often worn into deep grooves by the friction of the ropes which have been drawing up buckets from the depth for hundreds or thousands of years. Many of the cisterns and wells are closed with broad flat slabs of stone, each of them pierced with a round hole in the middle, which forms the mouth of the well or cistern. Often the hole in its turn is stopped with a stone so heavy that it requires the united strength of two or three men to roll it away. Round the well usually stand a number of stone troughs into which the water drawn up in the buckets is poured for the use of the cattle. Built into these troughs and serving to support them may sometimes be seen fragments of ancient marble columns. The scene at one of these wells, when flocks and herds are gathered round, and men and women are busy drawing up water, pouring it into the troughs, and watering the animals, is animated and pleasing. The traveller feels himself transported into the patriarchal age, especially if he chance to be there at daybreak and to see in the distance, across the plain, strings of camels converging on the well and casting long shadows before them in the light of the rising sun.[2]

Women as shepherdesses in Palestine.

In modern times, as in Jacob's day, it is sometimes the women who drive the flocks to the wells to be watered. "Who that has travelled much in this country has not often arrived at a well in the heat of the day which was surrounded with numerous flocks of sheep waiting to be watered? I once saw such a scene in the burning plains of northern Syria.

[1] C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land*, pp. 218 *sq.*

[2] Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Second Edition (London, 1856), i. 201, 204, 490, ii. 22, 26, 35, 226, 378; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (London, 1859), p. 589; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, Fourth Edition (London, 1882), pp. 363 *sqq.*; C. R. Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, New Edition (London, 1885), pp. 246-248.

Half-naked, fierce-looking men were drawing up water in leather buckets; flock after flock was brought up, watered, and sent away; and after all the men had ended their work, then several women and girls brought up their flocks and drew water for them."[1] "In the Negeb, as I have often observed, the flocks of sheep or goats are entrusted to the care of women or girls; in Moab this occupation is rather reserved for the men, though not to the exclusion of women. At Gebal and near Neba I have several times met flocks confided to the charge of a girl. The fact is indeed very inconvenient for the traveller, who may wish to buy a sheep or procure milk. He cannot treat with a woman and is obliged to await a better opportunity."[2]

Unmarried girls as shepherdesses among the Arabs of Sinai.

"Among the Arabs of Sinai and those of the Egyptian Sherkieh, it is an established rule that neither men nor boys should ever drive the cattle to pasture. This is the exclusive duty of the unmarried girls of the camp, who perform it by turns. They set out before sun-rise, three or four together, carrying some water and victuals with them, and they return late in the evening. Among other Bedouins, slaves or servants take the flocks to pasture. Thus early accustomed to such fatiguing duties, the Sinai women are as hardy as the men. I have seen those females running barefooted over sharp rocks where I, well shod, could with difficulty step along. During the whole day they continue exposed to the sun, carefully watching the sheep; for they are sure of being severely beaten by their father, should any be lost. If a man of their tribe passes by the pasturing ground, they offer to him some sheep's milk, or share with him their scanty stock of water, as kindly as their parents would have treated him in their tent."[3]

§ 2. *Weeping as a Salutation*

The weeping of Jacob at his meeting with Rachel.

The commentators on Genesis are a little puzzled to explain why Jacob, on kissing his pretty cousin Rachel,

[1] W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (London, 1859), p. 589.

[2] Antonin Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab* (Paris, 1908), p. 34.

[3] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys* (London, 1831), i. 351 *sq.* In this passage the text reads "They set out before sun-set," but here "sun-set" is clearly a mistake for "sun-rise," and I have corrected it accordingly.

should have burst into tears. They suppose that his tears flowed for joy at the happy termination of his journey, and they account for this mode of manifesting pleasure by the greater sensibility of Oriental peoples, or by the less degree of control which they exercise over the expression of their feelings. The explanation perhaps contains a measure of truth; but the commentators have apparently failed to notice that among not a few races weeping is a conventional mode of greeting strangers or friends, especially after a long absence, and that as such it is often a simple formality attended with hardly more emotion than our custom of shaking hands or raising the hat. Examples of the custom will make this clear.

Other instances of weeping at the meeting of friends in the Old Testament.

In the Old Testament itself we meet with other examples of thus saluting relations or friends. When Joseph revealed himself to his brethren in Egypt, he kissed them and wept so loudly that the Egyptians in another part of the house heard him.[1] But his tears on that occasion were probably a natural, not a mere conventional, expression of his feelings. Indeed this is rendered almost certain by the touching incident at his first meeting with Benjamin, when, moved beyond his power of control by the sight of his long-lost and best-loved brother, he hastily quitted the audience chamber and retiring to his own room wept there alone, till he could command himself again; then he washed his red eyes and tear-wetted cheeks, and returned with a steady face to his brethren.[2] Again, when Joseph met his aged father Jacob at Goshen, he fell on the old man's neck and wept a good while.[3] But here too his tears probably welled up from the heart when he saw the grey head bent humbly before him, and remembered all his father's kindness to him in the days of his youth so long ago. Again, when the two dear friends David and Jonathan met in a dark hour for the last time, with a presentiment perhaps that they should see each other no more, they kissed one another and wept one with another, till David exceeded.[4] Here also we may well believe that the emotion was unfeigned. Once more we read in the *Book of Tobit* how when Tobias was come as a stranger to the house of his kinsman

[1] Genesis xlv. 2, 14 *sq.*
[2] Genesis xliii. 30 *sq.*
[3] Genesis xlvi. 29.
[4] 1 Samuel xx. 41.

Raguel in Ecbatana, and had revealed himself to his host, "then Raguel leaped up, and kissed him, and wept."[1] Even here, however, the outburst of tears may have been an effect of joyous surprise rather than a mere conformity to social custom.

Weeping at the meeting and parting of friends among the Maoris of New Zealand.

But however it may have been with the Hebrews, it seems certain that among races at a lower level of culture the shedding of tears at meeting or parting is often little or nothing more than a formal compliance with an etiquette prescribed by polite society. One of the peoples among whom this display of real or artificial emotion was rigorously required of all who had any claim to good breeding, were the Maoris of New Zealand. "The affectionate disposition of the people," we are told, "appears more, however, in the departure and return of friends. Should a friend be going a short voyage to Port Jackson, or Van Dieman's Land, a great display of outward feeling is made: it commences with a kind of ogling glance, then a whimper, and an affectionate exclamation; then a tear begins to glisten in the eye; a wry face is drawn; then they will shuffle nearer to the individual, and at length cling round his neck. They then begin to cry outright, and to use the flint about the face and arms; and, at last, to roar most outrageously, and almost to smother with kisses, tears, and blood, the poor fellow who is anxious to escape all this. On the return of friends, or when visited by them from a distance, the same scene, only more universally, is gone through; and it is difficult to keep your own tears from falling at the melancholy sight they present, and the miserable howlings and discordant noises which they make. There is much of the cant of affection in all this; for they can keep within a short distance of the person over whom they know they must weep, till they have prepared themselves by thinking, and have worked themselves up to the proper pitch; when, with a rush of pretended eagerness, they grasp their victim (for that is the best term to use), and commence at once to operate upon their own bodies, and upon his patience. There is one thing worthy of observation, that, as they can command tears to appear, upon all occasions, at a moment's warning,

[1] Tobit vii. 6.

so they can cease crying when told to do so, or when it becomes inconvenient to continue it longer. I was once much amused at a scene of this kind, which happened at a village called Kaikohi, about ten miles from the Waimate. Half-a-dozen of their friends and relations had returned, after an absence of six months, from a visit to the Thames. They were all busily engaged in the usual routine of crying; when two of the women of the village, suddenly, at a signal one from the other, dried up their tears, closed the sluices of their affection, and very innocently said to the assembly: 'We have not finished crying yet: we will go and put the food in the oven, cook it, and make the baskets for it, and then we will come and finish crying; perhaps we shall not have done when the food is ready; and if not, we can cry again at night.' All this, in a canting, whining tone of voice, was concluded with a 'Shan't it be so? he! shan't it be so? he!' I spoke to them about their hypocrisy, when they knew they did not care, so much as the value of a potato, whether they should ever see those persons again, over whom they had been crying. The answer I received was, 'Ha! a New Zealander's love is all outside: it is in his eyes, and his mouth.'"[1] The navigator Captain P. Dillon frequently fell a victim to these uproarious demonstrations of affection, and he tells us how he contrived to respond to them in an appropriate manner. "It is the custom," he says, "in New Zealand, when friends or relations meet after long absence, for both parties to touch noses and shed tears. With this ceremony I have frequently complied out of courtesy; for my failure in this respect would have been considered a breach of friendship, and I should have been regarded as little better than a barbarian, according to the rules of New Zealand politeness. Unfortunately, however, my hard heart could not upon all occasions readily produce a tear, not being made of such melting stuff as those of the New Zealanders; but the application of a pocket handkerchief to my eyes for some time, accompanied with an occasional howl in the native language, answered all the purposes of real grief. This ceremony is dispensed with from strange Europeans; but with me it was indispensable,

Other accounts of weeping as a form of salutation among the Maoris.

[1] W. Yate, *An Account of New Zealand* (London, 1835), pp. 100-102.

I being a *Thongata moury*; that is, a New Zealander, or countryman, as they were pleased to term me."[1] Again, we read that "emotion characterised the meeting of New Zealanders, but parting was generally unattended by any outward display. At meeting men and women pressed their noses together, during which, in a low lachrymose whine, they repeated amidst showers of tears circumstances which had occurred mutually interesting since they last met. Silent grief is unknown among them. When the parties meeting are near relatives and have been long absent, the pressing of noses and crying were continued for half an hour; when the meeting was between accidental acquaintances, it was merely nose to nose and away. This salutation is called *hongi*, and is defined as a smelling. Like the Eastern custom of eating salt, it destroyed hostility between enemies. During the *hongi* the lips never met, there was no kissing."[2]

Weeping as a form of salutation among the Andaman Islanders and in India.

Again, among the aborigines of the Andaman Islands "relatives, after an absence of a few weeks or months, testify their joy at meeting by sitting with their arms round each other's necks, and weeping and howling in a manner which would lead a stranger to suppose that some great sorrow had befallen them; and, in point of fact, there is no difference observable between their demonstrations of joy and those of grief at the death of one of their number. The crying chorus is started by women, but the men speedily chime in, and groups of three or four may thus be seen weeping in concert until, from sheer exhaustion, they are compelled to desist."[3] Among the people of Mungeli Tahsil, in the Bilaspore district of India, "it is an invariable practice when relatives come together who have not met for a long while, for the womenfolk to weep and wail loudly. A son has been away for months and returns to his parents' house. He will first go and touch the feet of his father and mother. When he has been seated, the mother and sisters come to him and each in turn, placing both hands on his shoulders,

[1] Chevalier Capt. P. Dillon, *Narrative and Successful Result of a Voyage to the South Seas* (London, 1829), i. 211 *sq.*

[2] A. S. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand* (London, 1859), i. 200. Compare R. Taylor, *Te Ika a Maui, or New Zealand and its Inhabitants*, Second Edition (London, 1870), p. 222.

[3] E. H. Man, *On the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands*, Second Edition (London, N.D.), pp. 79 *sq.*

weeps loudly and in a wailing tone narrates anything special that has taken place in his absence."[1] Among the Chauhans of the Central Provinces in India etiquette requires that women should weep whenever they meet relatives from a distance. "In such cases when two women see each other they cry together, each placing her head on the other's shoulder and her hands at her sides. While they cry they change the position of their heads two or three times, and each addresses the other according to their relationship, as mother, sister, and so on. Or if any member of the family has recently died, they call upon him or her, exclaiming 'O my mother! O my sister! O my father! Why did not I, unfortunate one, die instead of thee?' A woman when weeping with a man holds to his sides and rests her head against his breast. The man exclaims at intervals, 'Stop crying, do not cry.' When two women are weeping together it is a point of etiquette that the elder should stop first and then beg her companion to do so, but if it is doubtful which is the elder, they sometimes go on crying for an hour at a time, exciting the younger spectators to mirth, until at length some elder steps forward and tells one of them to stop."[2]

Weeping as a form of salutation among the Indians of South America.

The custom of shedding floods of tears as a sign of welcome seems to have been common among the Indian tribes of both South and North America.[3] Among the Tupis of Brazil, who inhabited the country in the neighbourhood of Rio de Janeiro, etiquette required that when a stranger entered the hut where he expected to receive hospitality, he should seat himself in the hammock of his host and remain there for some time in pensive silence. Then the women of the house would approach, and sitting down on the ground about the hammock, they would cover their faces with their hands, burst into tears, and bid the stranger welcome, weeping and paying him compliments in the same breath. While these demonstrations were proceeding, the stranger on his part was expected to weep in

[1] Rev. E. M. Gordon, "Notes concerning the people of Mungeli Tahsil, Bilaspore District," *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, New Series, i. (1905) p. 184.

[2] R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), ii. 428.

[3] Much evidence of the custom is collected by G. Friederici, "Der tränengruss der Indianer," *Globus*, lxxxix. (1906) pp. 30-34.

sympathy, or if he could not command real tears, the least he could do was to heave deep sighs and to look as lugubrious as possible. When these formalities, exacted by the Tupi code of good manners, had been duly complied with, the host, who had hitherto remained an apparently indifferent and unconcerned spectator, would approach his guest and enter into conversation with him.[1] The Lenguas, an Indian tribe of the Chaco, "employ among themselves a singular form of politeness when they see again any one after some time of absence. It consists in this: the two Indians shed some tears before they utter a word to each other; to act otherwise would be an insult, or at least a proof that the visit was not welcome."[2]

Weeping as a form of salutation among the Indians of North America.

In the sixteenth century the Spanish explorer, Cabeça de Vaca, describes a similar custom observed by two tribes of Indians who inhabited an island off what seems to be now the coast of Texas. "On the island," he says, "there dwell two peoples speaking different languages, of whom the one are called Capoques and the other Han. They have a custom that when they know each other and see each other from time to time, they weep for half an hour before they speak to one another. Then the one who receives the visit rises first and gives all he possesses to the other, who accepts it and soon afterwards goes away; sometimes even, after the gift has been accepted, they go away without speaking a word."[3] In the seventeenth century the French missionary, L. Hennepin, has recorded a custom of the same sort among the Sioux, though apparently he mistook these conventional

[1] J. Lerius (Lery), *Historia Navigationis in Brasiliam quae et America dicitur* (1586), pp. 251-253; André Thevet, *Les Singularitez de la France Antarctique*, Nouvelle Édition (Paris, 1878), pp. 225 *sq.* (fol. 85). According to Thevet, the host himself also wept in sign of welcome, sitting in his hammock. Compare Pero de Magalhanes de Gandavo, *Histoire de la province de Sancta-Cruz que nous nommons ordinairement le Bresil* (Paris, 1837), pp. 113 *sq.* (in H. Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages, Relations et Mémoires originaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Découverte de l'Amérique*); Yves d'Évreux, *Voyage dans le Nord du Brésil* (Leipsic and Paris, 1864), pp. 37, 90, 220; François Coreal, *Voyages aux Indes Occidentales* (Amsterdam, 1722), i. 236-238.

[2] F. de Azara, *Voyages dans l'Amérique Méridionale* (Paris, 1809), ii. 151.

[3] Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, "Naufragos y Relacion," in E. de Vedia, *Historiadores Primitivos de Indias* (Madrid, 1852–1853), vol. i. p. 529, cap. xv.; *id.* in H. Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages, Relations et Mémoires Originaux pour servir à l'Histoire de la Découverte de l'Amérique* (Paris, 1837),

tears at greeting for genuine expressions of sorrow. He tells us how, during his captivity among the Indians, old men came and wept copiously, putting their hands on his head and rubbing his arms and the whole of his body. He did not know what to make of it, but thought the old men might be moved to compassion by the sight of the ill-treatment to which he and his fellow-captives were subjected. He received similar marks of regard on several occasions while he resided with the Sioux.[1] Another Frenchman, Nicolas Perrot, who lived among the Indians for many years in the latter part of the seventeenth century, describes how a party of Sioux, visiting a village of their friends the Ottawas, "had no sooner arrived than they began, in accordance with custom, to weep over all whom they met, in order to signify to them the sensible joy they felt at having found them."[2] Indeed, the Frenchman himself was more than once made the object, or rather the victim, of the like doleful demonstrations. Being sent by the governor of New France to treat with the Indian tribes beyond the Mississippi, he took up his quarters on the banks of that river, and there received an embassy from the Ayeos, the neighbours and allies of the Sioux, whose village lay some days to the westward, and who wished to enter into friendly relations with the French. A French historian has described the meeting of these Indian ambassadors with poor Perrot. They wept over him till the tears ran down their bodies; they beslobbered him with the filth which exuded from their mouths and their noses, smearing it on his head, his face, and his clothes, till he was almost turned sick by their caresses, while all the time they shrieked and howled most lamentably. At last the present of a few knives and awls had the effect of checking these noisy

pp. 116 *sq.* Compare G. Friederici, "Der Tränengruss der Indianer," *Globus*, lxxxix. (1906) p. 32. From the mishaps which they suffered on it, the Spaniards named the island the Isle of Misfortune (*Isla del Malhado*).

[1] Le R. P. Louis Hennepin, *Description de la Louisiane* (Paris, 1688), pp. 229 *sq.*, 242, 245, 247. Compare "Découverte d'un pays plus grand que l'Europe situé dans l'Amérique," *Recueil de Voiages au Nord* (Amsterdam, 1731–1738), ix. 313 *sq.*, 327. Hennepin calls the Indians, among whom he was captive, the Nadouessiou or Nadousiouz, and of this name the ordinary form Sioux is merely an abbreviation. See F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico* (Washington, 1907–1910), ii. 9, *s.v.* "Nadowa."

[2] Nicolas Perrot, *Memoire sur les Mœurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale* (Leipsic and Paris, 1864), p. 86.

effusions; but having no interpreter with them, they were quite unable to make themselves intelligible, and so had to return the way they came without effecting their purpose. A few days later four other Indians arrived, one of whom spoke a language understood by the French. He explained that their village was nine leagues up the river, and he invited the French to visit it. The invitation was accepted. At the approach of the strangers the women fled to the woods and the mountains, weeping and stretching out their arms to the sun. However, twenty of the chief men appeared, offered Perrot the pipe of peace, and carried him on a buffalo's skin into the chief's hut. Having deposited him there, they and the chief proceeded to weep over him in the usual way, bedewing his head with the moisture which dripped from their eyes, their mouths, and their noses. When that indispensable ceremony was over, they dried their eyes and their noses, and offered him the pipe of peace once more. "Never in the world," adds the French historian, "were seen such people for weeping; their meetings are accompanied by tears, and their partings are equally tearful."[1]

Such salutations may be intended to form a corporeal union with the person saluted. Ceremony at the initiation of a scavenger in the Punjab.

Disgusting as such forms of salutation may seem to us, it is not impossible that the application of all these exudations to the person of the stranger was not a mere accident, the effect of uncontrollable emotion, but that it may have been seriously intended to form a corporeal as well as a spiritual union with him by joining parts of their body to his. At least this is suggested by a similar ceremony which the Chuhras, the sweepers or scavengers of the Punjab, perform over a candidate for admission to their ignoble order. "Over a rectangular pit is put a *chárpái*, and

[1] De la Potherie, ii. 182-184, quoted by J. Taïlhan, in his notes to Nicolas Perrot, *Memoire sur les Mœurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale* (Leipsic and Paris, 1864), pp. 197 *sq.* In the account of the first interview which Perrot had with these savages we read: "*Ils abordèrent le François* [*Perrot*] *en pleurant à chaudes larmes qu'ils faisoient couler dans leurs mains avec de la salive et autre saleté qui leur sortait du nez, dont ils leur frottoient la tête, le visage et les habits. Toutes ces caresses lui faisoient bondir le cœur.*" Here the context suggests that "*ils leur frottoient la tête*," etc., is a mistake for "*ils lui frottoient la tête*," etc., and this is confirmed by the account of Perrot's second interview with the Indians: "*ce chef se mit à pleurer sur la tête en la mouillant de ses larmes et des eaux, qui distilloient de sa bouche et du nez.*" Accordingly I have so understood and paraphrased the first passage in the text.

beneath it the candidate is seated in the pit, while the Chuhrás sit on the *chárpái*. Each bathes in turn, clearing his nose and spitting, so that all the water, etc., falls on to the man in the pit. He is then allowed to come out and seated on the *chárpái*. After this all the Chuhrás wash his body and eat with him, and then ask him to adopt their profession." In explanation of this ceremony we are told that "Chuhrás think that the dirt of their own bodies purifies others, and they so remove it with their own hands. If a man follows their occupation but does not undergo the ordeal described above, they do not treat him as a Chuhrá or effect any relationship with him."[1] On this explanation it may be observed that, while ideas of purification no doubt differ widely in different peoples, it is difficult to believe that a very high degree of ceremonial cleanliness can be regarded as indispensable to any man who would engage in the business of scavenging and sweeping the streets. It seems more probable that the process of bedewing the candidate with the dirty water, spittle, and nasal excretion of other scavengers is intended not so much to purge him from all uncleanness as, on the contrary, to dirty him with the dirt of his future colleagues, and, by sinking him to their level, to make him one with them.

Use of spittle at initiation into a secret society among the Baluba of the Congo.

Certainly spittle has been employed as a bond of union by other peoples besides these Indian scavengers. For example, among the Baluba, a tribe of the Belgian Congo, a ceremony performed at initiating a candidate into the secret order of sorcerers is as follows. A new pot is produced, containing beer, flour, and two kinds of bark. Each sorcerer then spits into the pot, and the candidate must swallow the contents of the pot without wincing or pulling a wry face. When he has gulped it down, the grand master addresses him, saying, "You have drunk something of ourselves. Know that henceforth you will be powerless to injure us by your charms, since after our death we should be able to take vengeance and to come and seize you." So saying he breaks the pot.[2] Here the notion is

[1] H. A. Rose, *Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, ii. (Lahore, 1911) p. 192.

[2] H. Trilles, *Le Totémisme chez les Fân* (Münster i. W. 1912), p. 462, quoting P. Colle, in *Bulletin des Pères Blancs*, Anvers, 15 Août 1908, pp. 229 *sqq.*

that spittle, being part of a man, confers on the spitter a magical power over him who has swallowed it. The case thus falls under the general head of Contagious Magic.[1] Hence it is natural that spittle, as a part of the person, should be used like blood to form the cement of a binding covenant. It is so used, for example, by the Wachaga of East Africa. When two persons of that tribe wish to make a solemn agreement which will be obligatory on both parties, they sit down on a hide with a vessel of milk or beer between them. Each of them then utters the oath, waving a stick in a circle over the liquid. Having done so, each of them takes a mouthful of the milk or beer and spits it into the mouth of the other, or they both spit the mouthful back into the vessel, and then drink the contents of the vessel together. They believe that should either of them forswear himself, the liquid which he has swallowed will kill him. If the matter is pressing and there is no time for these formalities, the two covenanters will simply spit into each other's mouths, and this answers the purpose of giving a guarantee of good faith equally well. In whichever form the covenant is concluded, the spittle which passes from the body of the one covenanter into the body of the other is conceived as the magical substance which ensures the fulfilment of the agreement.[2] The Nandi of British East Africa similarly make use of spittle in ratifying agreements and imparting blessings. Thus in concluding a covenant of peace or arranging a marriage, both parties spit to make sure that the pact will be kept; and when a man has sold cattle, grain, or household utensils, he spits to show that the sale is complete. Again, old people and warriors often spit on children when they greet them; and a dying father, uncle, or elder will spit in a boy's hand when the lad comes to bid him farewell, and the grateful youth will rub the dying man's spittle on his face.[3] So among the Masai of British East Africa, when small children salute very old men, the greybeards spit on them,

Use of spittle at covenanting and saluting among tribes of East Africa.

[1] *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, i. 53 *sq.*, 174 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part i.).

[2] J. Raum, "Blut- und Speichelbünde bei den Wadschagga," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, x. (1907) pp. 290 *sq.*

[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi* (Oxford, 1909), pp. 78 *sq.*

saying, "May God give you long life and grey hairs like mine."[1] Among the Suk, another tribe of British East Africa, before a man shakes hands with you he spits on his hands.[2] "Not only amongst the Masai, but in the allied Nandi and Suk peoples, to spit at a person is a very great compliment. The earlier travellers in Masailand were astonished, when making friendship with old Masai chiefs and head-men, to be constantly spat at. When I entered the Uganda Protectorate and met the Masai of the Rift Valley for the first time, every man, before extending his hand to me, would spit on the palm."[3] At Orango, in the Bissagos Archipelago, when two men wish to make friends, they spit into each other's hands,[4] probably as a guarantee of mutual confidence and good faith, since in so doing each of them, on the principles of sympathetic magic, places himself at the mercy of the other by entrusting him with a vital portion of himself.

The springs of tears and laughter.

Such modes of salutation, and of cementing friendship, however kindly meant, appear at least as strange to Europeans as the tears which the demonstrative savage sheds at meeting and parting. Perhaps they cannot be fully understood till science has determined more exactly the laws, based on our physical and mental constitution, which govern the expression of the emotions and the different degrees of emotional susceptibility in the different races of man. But to engage in such an inquiry would be to outstep the limits of folk-lore, and to trespass on the spheres of those other, though kindred, studies which take for their provinces the human body and mind. The springs of tears and laughter, we are told, lie not far apart, yet they remain enveloped in a mystery more baffling than that which so long shrouded the sources of the Nile. In truth, it is easier for man to ascertain the facts and operations of external nature than to understand himself.

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai* (Oxford, 1905), p. 316.

[2] Mervyn W. H. Beech, *The Suk, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1911), p. 25.

[3] Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, Second Edition (London, 1904), ii. 833.

[4] C. de Mensignac, *Recherches Ethnographiques sur la Salive et le Crachat* (Bordeaux, 1892), p. 22.

CHAPTER VI

JACOB'S MARRIAGE

§ 1. *Jacob and his two Wives*

Different motives assigned by the Biblical writers for Jacob's journey to Haran.

OF the motives which induced Jacob to undertake the long journey to Haran, two very different accounts are given in Genesis. According to one account, which we owe mainly or entirely to the Jehovistic writer, Jacob fled to his uncle Laban in Haran in order to escape the vengeance of his brother Esau, whom he had angered by supplanting him in the inheritance and the blessing of their father Isaac, and he purposed to stay only a few days with his kinsfolk in the far country till his brother's hot anger against him had cooled.[1] According to the other account, which we owe to the Priestly writer alone, Jacob was sent by his parents to find a wife for himself among his kinsfolk in Haran, because they did not wish him to marry one of the strange Hittite women of Canaan.[2] As the Priestly writer composed his history of the patriarchal age several centuries after the Jehovistic writer,[3] it is reasonable to suppose that, viewing the old narratives from the standpoint of a higher morality, he was shocked at the cheat said to have been practised by Jacob on his elder brother, and that he endeavoured to put a more favourable colour on the patriarch's journey to Haran by representing it, not as a flight to escape the just anger of an injured brother, but as a mission to fulfil a pious

[1] Genesis xxv. 29-34, xxvii. 1-45. The latter narrative is commonly supposed by critics to be a compilation from the Jehovistic and Elohistic documents, but there is no general agreement as to the analysis of the two sources. S. R. Driver held that "the narrative belongs chiefly, if not entirely, to J" (*The Book of Genesis*,[10] p. 255).

[2] Genesis xxvii. 46-xxviii. 7.

[3] See above, vol. i. p. 131.

duty, on which he was sent with the approval and blessing of his parents.

Aversion of Jews in later times to marriage with strange women, particularly women of the old Canaanite stock.

Whatever may have been the feeling in earlier days, we know that after the Babylonian captivity the current of popular opinion among the Jews ran strongly against marriages with women of foreign blood, particularly with women of the old Canaanite stock, whom now, perhaps, more than ever, they viewed askance as heathens and enemies of the national God Jehovah. After the return of the exiles to Jerusalem it was a matter of bitter self-reproach to them that many of their number had married "strange women of the peoples of the land"; and in a national assembly, held in the great square before the ruined temple, the repentant sinners made public confession of their guilt, and resolved to put away their foreign wives and the children whom they had by them. It was a strange scene. The return of the banished people fell at the beginning of the rainy season in autumn; and as the multitude sat crowded there together in the vast square, surrounded by the blackened ruins of the temple and of the city, the sky above them was dark with clouds, and the rain descended in sheets. Drenched and chilled they wept and shivered, less at the cold and the wet than at the thought of the divine wrath which they had incurred by their imprudent marriages, and which manifested itself even to the most sceptical in the nipping air and the driving rain. Many, perhaps most, of the exiles had never seen Jerusalem before; they had been born and bred by the broad, willow-fringed waters of Babylon, and coming straight from the burning heat and cloudless summer sky of that foreign, yet, to many of them, native land, they must have been sadly disenchanted by the first view of Zion, the city of which their fathers had told them so much, and to which their thoughts and hearts had longingly turned for so many years. It had been pictured to them as a sort of earthly paradise, the chosen home of God himself, the joy and pride of the whole earth. And this was the reality! this was Jerusalem! Those fallen walls! those blackened and crumbling ruins! yon bleak and frowning mountains! that lowering sky! that torrential rain! How many of the exiles may not have secretly yearned to return to the land of their banishment and

of their birth, on whose willow-trees they had hung their harps, and perhaps, though they hardly knew it, their hearts also.[1]

The Priestly writer's account of Jacob's marriage coloured by the late Jewish aversion to marriage with strange women.

In these days of national humiliation and repentance, when the Jews ascribed the disasters that had overwhelmed their country to the defilement which they had contracted by contamination with the Canaanites, the Priestly writer composed the history of his nation; and the whole work reflects the current spirit of the age. It was the time when, smarting under the bitter disappointment of their secular ambitions, the people sought for consolation in the spiritual sphere by dedicating themselves wholly to the worship of God and separating themselves more sharply than ever from the alien races which surrounded them, and in which the leaders of the people beheld the source of all their misfortunes. No wonder that, writing in such an age, the Priestly historian should have remembered that Jacob in Palestine, like Abraham and Isaac before him, was a sojourner in a strange land, and believing that his parents must have been loath to see him wedded to a native wife, should have assigned that reluctance as their true motive for sending him away for a time to their kinsfolk in Haran. The ascription of this motive to Isaac and Rebekah was all the more natural, because the Priestly writer did not invent the marriage of Jacob with his cousins Leah and Rachel, but found it recorded in the earlier sources on which he drew. For the beautiful narrative of Jacob's love and marriage is from the pen of the much earlier Jehovistic and Elohistic writers; the dull Priestly historian has accepted the narrative at their hands, and has merely done his best to spoil the romantic colouring of the story by representing the marriage, not as one of love at first sight, but as a mere *mariage de convenance* which Jacob contracted, not as an ardent lover, but as a dutiful son acting in obedience to the wishes of his parents. It is thus that a tincture of ethical theory, infused into the magic glass of old romance, can precipitate the prismatic hues of poetry into a grey powder of prose at the bottom.

Still, whatever motive may have led Jacob to Haran,

[1] Ezra ix.-x.

whether the fear of an angry brother, or the prospect of a blooming bride, we may take it as certain that according to Israelitish tradition he married his two cousins, Leah and Rachel, the daughters of Laban, his mother's brother, and that he had these two sisters to wife simultaneously, in their lifetime, having first wedded the elder, whom he did not love, and afterwards the younger, whom he did love, because the custom of the country forbade a younger sister to marry before her elder sister. Further, we learn that Jacob served Laban, his mother's brother and his father-in-law in one, for many years in the capacity of a shepherd and goatherd; and that he regarded his two wives and their children as the wages which he received for his long period of service.[1] In all these respects the story of Jacob's marriage, whether strictly historical or not, reflects the customs which have been observed at marriage by many more or less primitive peoples in many parts of the world; and accordingly we may fairly suppose that at an early stage of their history similar customs were practised by the Israelites, although in later ages they fell into abeyance. The customs in question may conveniently be distinguished as three in number, namely: first, marriage with a cousin, and in particular the marriage of a man with his mother's brother's daughter, or, to put it conversely, the marriage of a woman with her father's sister's son; second, the marriage of a man with two sisters in their lifetime, the elder sister being married before the younger; and third, the practice of a son-in-law serving his father-in-law for a wife. All three customs I propose to illustrate by examples, and afterwards to inquire into their origin and meaning. Although in doing so we shall wander far from our immediate subject, which is the folk-lore of ancient Israel, the excursion may be pardoned if it sheds a sober light on the exquisite pictures of the patriarchal age in Genesis, and thereby helps to reveal the depth and solidity of the human background against which the figures of the patriarchs are painted.

The story of Jacob's marriage reflects customs observed at marriage by many races in many parts of the world.

In this inquiry we shall begin with the marriage of cousins.

[1] Genesis xxix.-xxxi.

§ 2. *The Marriage of Cousins*

Many races distinguish between *cross-cousins* (the children of a brother and a sister respectively), who are marriageable, and *ortho-cousins* (the children of two brothers or of two sisters), who are not marriageable.

Many races draw what may seem to Europeans a curious and superfluous distinction between cousins. They think that cousins who are the offspring of either two brothers or of two sisters stand on a wholly different footing from cousins who are the offspring of a brother and a sister, that is, cousins so related that the father of the one cousin is the mother's brother of the other cousin, or, to put it conversely, cousins so related that the mother of the one cousin is the father's sister of the other cousin. And on the sharp distinction drawn between these two classes of cousins the same races generally found a corresponding distinction in respect of marriageability; for while they strictly forbid marriage between cousins who are the children of two brothers or of two sisters, they allow or even strongly recommend marriage between cousins who are the children of a brother and a sister respectively, in other words, between cousins who are so related that the father of the one cousin is the mother's brother of the other cousin, or, to put it conversely, between cousins so related that the mother of the one cousin is the father's sister of the other cousin. It is convenient to have names to distinguish the two classes of cousins, the marriageable and the unmarriageable, from each other; and accordingly it has become customary to call the marriageable cousins *cross-cousins*, because, being the children of a brother and a sister respectively, the related parents are of opposite or cross sexes. There has hithero been no special name for the unmarriageable cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, but for convenience I propose to call them *ortho-cousins* to distinguish them from cross-cousins. In the case of ortho-cousins the related parents are of the same sex, whether both male or both female; whereas in the case of cross-cousins the related parents are of opposite sexes, the one being male and the other female.

Further distinction drawn by some races between cross-cousins.

Even among cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, certain races draw a distinction in respect of marriageability; for some people allow a man to marry his mother's brother's daughter but forbid him to

marry his father's sister's daughter, whereas, conversely, some people allow a man to marry his father's sister's daughter but forbid him to marry his mother's brother's daughter. Where this distinction is drawn, it is usually the mother's brother's daughter who is allowed, and the father's sister's daughter who is forbidden. More commonly, however, no such distinction is drawn between cross-cousins, and all are allowed to marry each other indifferently; in other words, a man is free to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, and a woman is free to marry the son either of her father's sister or of her mother's brother.

§ 3. *The Marriage of Cousins in India*[1]

Distinction in respect of cousin marriage between the Aryans, and the aborigines of India.

When the Aryans entered India from the north-west and gradually spread over the vast plains of the Punjab and Bengal, they encountered and drove before them southward into the mountains those races of swarthier complexion and coarser features whose descendants still occupy a great part of the peninsula. Among these aboriginal tribes the conquering immigrants observed the custom of marriage between cross-cousins. For in an ancient law-book, drawn up some centuries before our era for the use of the Aryans of India, a sharp distinction is drawn between the customs prevalent in the north and in the south, and among the usages characteristic of the south are mentioned the practices of eating in the company of uninitiated persons, of eating in the company of a man's wife, and of marrying a cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister. The comments of the writer who records these customs seem to show that in his age opinions differed as to the legality of the practices in question, for while some people held them to be lawful within the countries where they prevailed, others condemned them everywhere.[2] At a later time Hindoo

[1] The subject of cousin marriages in India has been discussed by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers in a very lucid and instructive essay, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, pp. 611-640.

[2] Baudhâyana, I. i. 2, in *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, translated by G. Bühler, Part ii. (Oxford, 1882) pp. 146-149 (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiv.). Professor Bühler would apparently date Baudhâyana somewhere between 700 and 550 B.C. See

Marriage of cousins forbidden by Hindoo law, ancient and modern.

opinion as to the marriage of cousins hardened and crystallized into an absolute condemnation. In the great metrical law-book known as *The Laws of Manu*, which may have assumed its final form about two hundred years after the beginning of our era,[1] it is expressly laid down that "he who has approached the daughter of his father's sister, (who is almost equal to) a sister, (the daughter) of his mother's sister, or of his mother's full brother, shall perform a lunar penance. A wise man should not take as his wife any of these three; they must not be wedded because they are (*Sapinda*-) relatives, he who marries (one of them) sinks low."[2] So to this day among Hindoos the marriage of all first cousins is strictly barred by the rule recorded in a common formula: *chacherā*, *mamerų*, *phuphera*, *musera*, *ye chār nātā bachāke shadi hotī hai*, "the line of paternal uncle, maternal uncle, paternal aunt, maternal aunt, these four relationships are to be avoided in marriage."[3]

Among the aborigines of India to this day marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, is commonly preferred to all others.

The line of cleavage in this respect between the invading Aryans and the aboriginal races persists to a great extent to this day; for among many of these aborigines the marriage of a man with his cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, is still not only allowed but even preferred to all others; in some tribes and castes the man has a right to marry the girl, and can claim compensation if she is given in marriage to anybody else. And while the preference wavers in different places between the mother's brother's daughter and the father's sister's daughter as the most suitable wife for a man, on the whole the balance of opinion appears to preponderate decidedly in favour of union

his discussion, *op. cit.* pp. xxxv *sqq.*; and *The Sacred Laws of the Āryas*, Part i. (Oxford, 1879) pp. xxii, xliii (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii.). A somewhat later date (500–200 B.C.) is assigned by Professor A. A. Macdonell to the class of legal works to which Baudhâyana's book belongs. See *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), ii. 232.

[1] A. A. Macdonell, in *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), ii. 262.

[2] *The Laws of Manu*, xi. 172 *sq.*, translated by G. Bühler (Oxford, 1886), p. 466 (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv.).

[3] Sir Herbert Risley, *The People of India*, Second Edition, edited by W. Crooke (Calcutta, Simla, and London, 1915), p. 162. The use of this formula, as a reminder of the prohibited degrees, seems to be widespread in Northern India. See W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Calcutta, 1896), ii. 217, iii. 417.

with the mother's brother's daughter, the match of which Jacob's marriage with his mother's brother's daughters, Leah and Rachel, is the typical instance. And since on the whole the Aryan invasion has been confined to the north of India, while the great mass of the black aboriginal population remains entrenched in the south, it is in the south that the marriage of cousins continues to prevail; indeed it has there gained a footing even among classes which claim, rightly or wrongly, to be Brahmans. On this subject Mr. Edgar Thurston observes, "It is a prevalent custom throughout Southern India that a girl's father's sister's son has the first right to her hand in marriage. This obtains not only among the Dravidian peoples, but also among Brahmans. The Malayalam word for son-in-law (*marumakan*) means nephew. If a stranger should marry a girl, he also is called nephew. But the unmarried nephew, having the first admitted right to the girl, must be paid eight annas, or two *fanams*, before he will allow her to be taken away. The argument is said to be as follows. A sister pays forty-two *fanams* as *kanam* for her brother's wife. When the product, *i.e.* a daughter, is transferred to a stranger, the son claims compensation on his mother's investment at the same rate as that at which a coco-nut tree is valued—eight annas. At all events, the nephew has the first right to a girl, and must be compensated before she can be taken away by another."[1]

Marriage with a mother's brother's daughter prevalent in Southern India.

Too much stress need not be laid on the commercial theory which equates a girl to a coco-nut tree; for it is obviously the afterthought of a business age which seeks to reduce the old ties of blood to their exact equivalents in pounds, shillings, and pence, or rather in annas and *fanams*. The calculation may be neglected, but the fact should be borne in mind that, broadly speaking, all over Southern India a man has a right to the hand of his mother's brother's daughter, and must be compensated if she is given to another; and that in this region the custom in question is not confined to the aboriginal population, but extends to classes who, claiming to rank as Brahmans, implicitly assert their descent from the Aryan race.

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), vii. 60.

67308

Cross-cousin marriage among the Dravidians.

Conspicuous among the indigenous tribes of India who still favour the marriage of cross-cousins, are the Dravidians, the short, black, long-headed, broad-nosed people who occupy a large part of Southern and Central India from Ceylon to the valley of the Ganges and probably represent the earliest inhabitants of the peninsula of whom we have any knowledge.[1] To this ancient stock appear to belong the Veddas, a primitive tribe of hunters now greatly reduced in numbers and rapidly dying out, who roam the dense jungles and forests of Ceylon.[2] Now kinship among the Veddas is based on the marriage of cross-cousins, that is, on the marriage of a man either with the daughter of his mother's brother or with the daughter of his father's sister; and while both forms of marriage occur, there is some evidence to show that marriage with the mother's brother's daughter is preferred; according to one statement, the most correct marriage of all is that with the daughter of the mother's younger brother.[3] Among the Singhalese of Ceylon the most proper marriage which a man can contract is that with his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister. On the other hand he may not marry his first cousin, the daughter of his father's brother; such a union would be accounted incestuous.[4] Similarly among the Mohammedans of Ceylon preference is given to marriage with the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister.[5] In the State of Cochin, near the southern extremity of India, "the best form of marriage, among all castes below Brahmans, is where a young man marries the daughter of his maternal uncle, over whom he has a preferential claim."[6]

Cross-cousin marriage in Ceylon and Cochin.

[1] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), i. 296-299.

[2] In the opinion of Dr. and Mrs. C. G. Seligmann, who have made a careful study of the tribe, the Veddas belong to "the same race as the so-called Dravidian jungle tribes of Southern India," though they have long lost the Dravidian language and speak a dialect of Singhalese. See C. G. Seligmann and Brenda Z. Seligmann, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 380 *sqq.*, 413 *sqq.*

[3] C. G. Seligmann and Brenda Z. Seligmann, *The Veddas*, pp. 64 *sq.*

[4] J. Bailey, "An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S. ii. (London, 1863) p. 294.

[5] "The Marriage Customs of the Moors of Ceylon," *The Folk-lore Journal*, vi. (1888) p. 140.

[6] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes* (Madras, 1909-1912), i. 282. The writer is here speaking particularly of the Izhuvans, Illavans, or Tiyyans, a tribe widely spread in Malabar, Cochin, and

For example, among the Kadars or Kadirs, a very primitive tribe in the forests and jungles of Cochin and Travancore, who speak a Dravidian dialect but may have negrito blood in their veins, "marriage between persons descended in a direct line from the same parents is forbidden, if the relationship can be traced, but to some extent the custom prevails among them of a man's marrying the daughter of his maternal uncle." At the same time, while he is allowed or encouraged to marry the daughter of his mother's brother, he is forbidden to marry the daughter of his father's sister.[1]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Todas of the Neilgherry Hills in Southern India.

Similar customs in regard to the marriage of cousins prevail among the Todas, a primitive pastoral tribe of the Neilgherry Hills in Southern India, who resemble the primitive Kadars in speaking a Dravidian tongue, but differ from them very widely in physical type, mode of life, and natural surroundings. In this remarkable tribe, whose racial affinities are still very obscure, a man's proper wife, the woman whom he ought to marry, is his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister. But he is forbidden to marry his other first cousins, what I have called his ortho-cousins, namely the daughters of his father's brothers or of his mother's sisters. These latter cousins he includes under the general term *püliol*, which he applies to all the relatives with whom, by the custom of the tribe, he is prohibited from contracting marriage. And because he commonly marries the daughter of his mother's brother, he applies one and the same term (*mun*) to his mother's brother and to his father-in-law, even in cases where his father-in-law happens not to be his actual mother's brother. And similarly, because he commonly marries the daughter of his father's sister, he applies the same term (*mumi*) to his father's sister and to his mother-in-law.[2] It may be objected that though a man may

Travancore, but his remark appears to apply to all the tribes of Cochin. Compare further his work, vol. i. p. 74, vol. ii. pp. 105, 349, 367, 376, 380.

[1] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. 4 *sq.* As to this tribe see further E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), iii. 6 *sqq.*

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 487 *sq.*, 502, 509, 512 *sq.* Compare *id.* "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, pp. 612, 619 *sq.* As to the language of the Todas and the difficult question of their racial affinity, see W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas*, pp. 602 *sqq.*, 693 *sqq.*

marry either his mother's brother's daughter or his father's sister's daughter, he does not marry them both, and that accordingly he ought not at the same time to call his father-in-law his mother's brother and his mother-in-law his father's sister. The answer to this is that, in a case of fundamental importance for the understanding of the whole subject, a man's father-in-law and mother-in-law are simultaneously his mother's brother and his father's sister. The case is that in which two men exchange their sisters in marriage, and the cousins, the offspring of these two marriages, again intermarry; for in that case the male cousin marries a female cousin who is at once the daughter of his mother's brother and the daughter of his father's sister. In other words, his wife is simultaneously his mother's brother's daughter and his father's sister's daughter; and simultaneously his father-in-law is his mother's brother, and his mother-in-law is his father's sister. Later on we shall see reason to believe that this exchange of sisters in marriage is the root from which the whole widely ramified system of cross-cousin marriage springs.

Cross-cousin marriage common to the Tamil and Telugu branches of the Dravidian race.

The practice of marriage between cross-cousins is common in both the great branches of the Dravidian race which speak the Tamil and Telugu languages respectively. Tamil is, roughly speaking, the language of the northern part of Ceylon and the southern part of India, as far north as Mysore and the Ghauts on the west and the city of Madras or somewhat beyond it on the east. Telugu is the principal form of speech in the eastern part of the Indian peninsula from Madras to near Orissa. It is also spoken in the east of the Nizam's dominions and in the extreme south of the Central Provinces, extending into Berar.[1] I will give examples of cross-cousin marriage among both these branches of the Dravidian family, beginning with the Tamil-speaking people.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Tamils. The Kallans.

The Kallans of Madura and Tinnevelly, in the extreme south-east of India, are a Tamil caste who used to be notorious for their robberies and other crimes of violence. With regard to their marriage customs, "the most proper alliance

[1] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), i. 380 *sq.*

in the opinion of a Kallan is one between a man and the daughter of his father's sister; and if an individual have such a cousin, he must marry her, whatever disparity there may be between their respective ages. A boy of fifteen must marry such a cousin, even if she be thirty or forty years old, if her father insists upon him so doing. Failing a cousin of this sort, he must marry his aunt or his niece or any near relative."[1] We shall meet with other instances of Indian castes in which marriage with a niece, the daughter of a sister, is an alternative to marriage with a cross-cousin and is even sometimes preferred to it. Not only has a Kallan the first claim to the hand of his father's sister's daughter in marriage, but if she is given to wife to any one else, he can exact as compensation from her mother, his father's sister, the sum which the mother received as dowry at her own marriage.[2] Similarly among the Nattamans or Udaiyans, a caste of Tamil cultivators in Tanjore, Trichinopoly, and Madura, "a man has a right to marry the daughter of his father's sister, and if she is given to another man the father's sister has to return to her father or brother the dowry which she received at the time of her marriage, and this is given to the man who had the claim upon the girl."[3] Again, among the Vallambans, a small caste of Tamil cultivators in the Tanjore, Trichinopoly, and Madura districts of Southern India, a boy may claim as his right the hand either

The Nattamans or Udaiyans.

The Vallambans.

[1] J. H. Nelson, *The Madura Country, a Manual compiled by Order of the Madras Government* (Madras, 1868), Part ii. pp. 50 *sq.* Compare Edgar Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), iii. 76 *sq.* Mr. Nelson adds, "If his father's brother has a daughter, and insists upon him marrying her, he cannot refuse: and this whatever may be the woman's age." But marriage with the daughter of a father's *brother* stands on a totally different footing from marriage with the daughter of a father's *sister*; and people who permit or even encourage the latter marriage, generally prohibit the former. Hence we may suppose that in the passage which I have just quoted the words "his father's brother" are a mistake for "his father's sister" or "his father's sister's husband," though this involves a mere repetition of the statement which the writer had already made as to the obligation laid on a man to marry his father's sister's daughter, "if her father insists upon him so doing." Compare E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), p. 53; and as to the Kallans, see *id.*, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 53 *sqq.*

[2] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 158.

[3] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. Madras, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 169. As to the Nattamans or Udaiyans, see E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 206 *sqq.*

of his father's sister's daughter or of his mother's brother's daughter, so that a boy of ten may be wedded to a mature woman of twenty or twenty-five years, if she happens to be unmarried and without issue. In case of such a great discrepancy of age between husband and wife, any elderly male member of the youthful bridegroom's family—his elder brother, uncle, or even his father—will have intercourse with the bride and beget children by her, and these children the boy, when he comes of age, will accept as his own and legitimatize.[1] Similarly among the Konga Vellalas, a caste of Tamil cultivators in Trichinopoly, "the most desirable match for a boy is his maternal uncle's daughter. To such an extent is the preference for such unions carried out, that a young boy is often married to a grown-up woman, and it is admitted that, in such cases, the boy's father takes upon himself the duties of a husband until his son has reached maturity, and that the wife is allowed to consort with any one belonging to the caste whom she may fancy, provided that she continues to live in her husband's house."[2] Among the Nanchinad Vellalas of Travancore, the extreme southern country of India, a man's legitimate wife is either the daughter of his father's sister or the daughter of his mother's brother.[3] Again, among the Nattukottai Chettis, a wealthy caste of money-lenders in Madura, who have been called the Jews of South India, every man "is said to have the inviolable right to claim the hand of his paternal aunt's daughter. This being so, ill-assorted marriages are quite common, the putative father being often but a child."[4] The right to marry the daughter of a father's sister is also recognized among the

The Konga Vellalas.

The Nanchinad Vellalas.

The Nattukottai Chettis, &c.

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 300 *sq.*, quoting *Manual of the Madura District*. Compare *id.*, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, pp. 53 *sq.*

[2] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 418. The Vellalas, of whom the Kongas are a branch, "are the great cultivating caste of the Tamil country, and by general consent the first place in social esteem among the Tamil Súdra castes is awarded to them." They number over two and a quarter millions, and are dispersed all over the Madras Presidency. See *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 183.

[3] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 244.

[4] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 265. As to this caste, see *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), pp. 149 *sq.* It is not expressly said that the caste is Tamil, but from its geographical position in the heart of the Tamil country, I assume that it is so.

Pudunattu Idaiyans, a Tamil caste of shepherds in the Madura district,[1] among the Kottai Vellalas of Tinnevelly,[2] among the Uppilyans, a Tamil caste of salt-makers, found all over the Madras Presidency,[3] and among the Vannans, the washermen of the Tamil and Malayalam countries.[4]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Gurukkals and Mondis.

The Gurukkals or Kurukkals, who are priests of Tamil origin in Travancore, consider that the most proper wife for a man is his cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister.[5] Among the Mondis, a Tamil-speaking class of mendicants, "in the North Arcot district, it is customary for a man to marry his maternal uncle's daughter, and in the Madura district a man can claim his paternal aunt's daughter in marriage."[6] Thus, some of these beggars seem to prefer marriage with a mother's brother's daughter, while others look upon a father's sister's daughter as a man's proper wife.

The Maravars or Maravans.

The Maravars or Maravans are a turbulent Dravidian tribe of Madura and Tinnevelly, who have been little affected by Brahmanical influence and were formerly notorious for their crimes of violence and cattle-lifting, at which they were and are extremely expert. Among them cousins, the children of two brothers, are not allowed to marry each other; but on the other hand cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, not only may but should marry each other, if it can be arranged.[7]

The Paraiyans.

The Paraiyans are a low caste of agricultural labourers, widely spread over the Tamil country, from North Arcot to Tinnevelly, and inhabiting the southern extremity of the Native State of Travancore. Among them it is a rule that "the bridegroom must be older than the bride. Subject to this condition, it is usual for a youth to marry his father's sister's daughter, or his mother's brother's daughter. A girl should be married to her mother's brother's son if he is old enough, but not, as among the Konga

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, ii. 356.

[2] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* iv. 35.

[3] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* vii. 228 *sqq.*, 237.

[4] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* vii. 317.

[5] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* ii. 311.

[6] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* v. 73.

[7] F. Fawcett, "The Kondayamkottai Maravars, a Dravidian tribe of Tinnevelly, Southern India," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxiii. (1903) p. 62. As to the tribe see further E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 22 *sqq.*

Vellalas and some Reddis, if he is a child. In short, Paraiyans follow the usual Tamil custom, but it is often neglected."[1]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Koravas, Korachas, or Yerukalas.

The Koravas, Kuravas, Koramas, Korachas, Yerkalas, or Yerukalas are a ubiquitous set of vagrant and light-fingered gentry, found all over the Tamil country, who earn their bread by the precarious resources of fortune-telling, tattooing, quack medicine, and petty larceny. When railways spread over India, the Koravas seized the opportunity to extend the scope of their professional operations to other parts of the country, and reaped a golden harvest by relieving the sleeping passengers of their luggage, appearing suddenly in places where they were least expected, and departing, without leaving any address, when the hue and cry was hot behind them. Their origin is uncertain, but probably they belong to one of the aboriginal tribes, or at least have a large proportion of aboriginal blood in their veins. They speak a corrupt Tamil dialect, interlarded with Telugu and Canarese words; but they always know more than one language colloquially and can converse with the people of the countries through which they wander.[2] In their marriage customs the Koravas seem to prefer the union of a man with his father's sister's daughter, or, in other words, the union of a woman with her mother's brother's son; for we read that among them "a girl's mother's brother's son has the right to have her to wife, and, if his right is abrogated by giving her to another, he (or his father?) receives a penalty from the man to whom she is given. The girl's maternal uncle disposes of the girl."[3] However, in some parts of India, including Vizagapatam and Mysore, these vagrants allow a man to marry either with his father's sister's daughter or with his mother's brother's

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vi. 94.

[2] Full and interesting accounts of this criminal caste are given by E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 438 *sqq.*; and H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, vii. *Koracha Caste* (Bangalore, 1906). Compare J. A. Dubois, *Mœurs, Institutions et Cérémonies des Peuples de l'Inde* (Paris, 1825), i. 74 *sqq.* (who calls them Kouravers or Kouroumarous); J. Shortt, "On the Wild Tribes of Southern India," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S., vii. (1869) pp. 186 *sqq.*; *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), pp. 164.

[3] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 482, quoting Fawcett.

daughter.[1] But the orthodox marriage certainly seems to be with the daughter of the father's sister. For we read that "a custom prevails among them by which the first two daughters of a family may be claimed by the maternal uncle as wives for his sons. The value of a wife is fixed at twenty pagodas. The maternal uncle's right to the first two daughters is valued at eight out of twenty pagodas, and is carried out thus: If he urges his preferential claim, and marries his own sons to his nieces, he pays for each only twelve pagodas; and, similarly, if he, from not having sons, or any other cause, forgo his claim, he receives eight pagodas of the twenty paid to the girl's parents by anybody else who may marry them. The value of a wife differs in different places: in some places they are very much less, and in others again only nominal." [2]

Custom of marriage with a niece, the daughter of an elder sister, in some tribes of Southern India.

But the Korava uncle who gets his niece, the daughter of his sister, at a reduced price, is not obliged to hand her over to his son; he may keep her to himself, thus getting a wife at a bargain; for in this tribe, as in a number of other tribes of Southern India, a man has the option of marrying his niece, always provided that she is the daughter of his *elder* sister; the daughter of his *younger* sister he may not take to wife, unless indeed he should happen to be a widower.[3] This permission to marry a niece, the daughter of an elder sister, as an alternative to marrying a cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, appears to be particularly common in the Telugu-speaking branch of the Dravidian race, in which indeed marriage with such a niece is often preferred to marriage with such a cousin. Instances will meet us in our survey of cousin marriage among Telugu-speaking peoples, to whom we now turn.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Telugus.

The marriage of a man with the daughter of his mother's brother, and correspondingly of a girl with the son of her

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 484; H. V. Nandjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, vii. *Koracha Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), p. 7.

[2] J. Shortt, "The Wild Tribes of Southern India," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, New Series, vii. (1869) pp. 187 *sq.* The writer's statement as to the practice is confirmed by Mr. H. V. Nanjundayya, who puts the value of a wife and the reduced price offered to her uncle at the same figures (twenty and twelve pagodas respectively). See H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, vii. *Koracha Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), p. 7.

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *l.c.*

father's sister, seems to be common among the Telugu people, who have a special name (*mēnarikam*) for it.[1] It is observed with particular strictness by the Komatis, the great Telugu trading caste of the Madras Presidency, who are found, not only in almost all districts of Madras, but also in Mysore, the Bombay Presidency, Berar, the Central Provinces, and as far north-west as Baroda. They are devoted to their mother-tongue, and they have a common proverb that "Telugu is easy and Tamil is wretched." "Of all Dravidian languages," says an English writer, "Telugu is the sweetest and most musical. It is exceedingly mellifluous, and sounds harmonious even in the mouth of the most vulgar and illiterate. It has justly been called the Italian of the East."[2] Among the Komatis a boy is obliged to marry his mother's brother's daughter, however unattractive she may be; and conversely the mother's brother must give his daughter in marriage to his sister's son, however poor he may be. The custom is called *mēnarikam*.[3] The holy book of the caste, known as the *Kanyaka Purana*, is an eloquent and lasting monument of the inflexible rigidity with which the custom is, or ought to be, observed by all who believe in the inspiration of the sacred volume. We there read how a lovely maid received an offer of marriage from a neighbouring king, but sternly rejected the noble wooer, because he was no relation of hers, not even her second cousin twice removed. But the king, inflamed by love of her indescribable beauty, pressed his suit, and threatened, if he did not lead her to the altar, that he would besiege the city, clap the inhabitants into dark dungeons, and carry off the young lady in a palanquin. The dreadful threat produced a great impression. The members of the caste, to which the damsel belonged, met in council and deliberated whether they should give her to the king or not. The spiritual head of the caste took the chair at the meeting, and a resolution was passed to the effect, that rather than submit to the king's demands and

The Komatis.

The custom of cross-cousin marriage (*mēnarikam*) recommended in the *Kanyaka Purana*, the sacred book of the Komatis.

[1] Rev. J. E. Padfield, *The Hindu at Home* (Madras, 1896), p. 113.

[2] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 306, 307 *sq.*, quoting Mr. Henry Morris.

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, vi. *Komati Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), p. 8; *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 162; E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), p. 54; *id.*, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 314.

abandon the good old custom of marrying their mothers' brothers' daughters, they would perish in the flames. Although the resolution appears to have been carried by acclamation, when they came to the point of putting it in practice the courage of many failed them, and deciding that discretion was the better part of valour, they laid legs to the ground and fled from the city. A few stalwarts, however, persisted in their noble resolve, and among them was the beauteous maid who, though she had seen but some seven summers, nevertheless preferred death by fire to marriage with a king who was not the son of her mother's brother. Accordingly one hundred and three fire-pits were made ready for the accommodation of these martyrs to duty. Before they descended into them, they addressed their children, giving them solemn instructions as to how they were to behave when they too should be grown up and should have marriageable sons and daughters. "Do not," they charged them, "ask a bride-price for the marriage of your daughters. Do not communicate secrets to females. Do not allow rulers, infidels, and village accountants to set foot in your houses. Be sure to give your daughters in marriage to the sons of their fathers' sisters, even though the young men should be black-skinned, plain, blind of one eye, senseless, of vicious habits, and though their horoscopes should not agree, and the omens be inauspicious. However, should the young man in question, the son of the father's sister, be blind of both eyes, deaf, insane, stricken with disease, a eunuch, thief, idiot, leper, dwarf, or immoral, or should he be an old man or younger than the girl, you need not give her to him to wife." When they had thus taught their children the way they should go, the lovely maid, who scorned to wed a king, came forward in her turn and addressed the spectators gathered about the fire-pits. She solemnly blessed the few choice spirits of her caste who had resolved to follow her to the death rather than be false to the great principle of marrying their mothers' brothers' daughters; as for the cravens who had fled away, she cursed them, and prayed that Brahma would create no more beautiful girls among their descendants, but that for the future their daughters might be dumpy, with gaping mouths, disproportionate legs, broad ears, crooked hands, red hair, sunken

eyes, dilated eye-balls, insane looks, broad noses, wide nostrils, hairy bodies, black skin, and protruding teeth. With these last words, and in this charitable frame of mind, she jumped into the fire-pit prepared for her; the other stalwarts with their wives did the same into the pits made ready for them respectively, and all were soon reduced to ashes.[1]

The custom of cross-cousin marriage still generally observed among the Komatis.

The same great principle, which is illustrated by the death of these noble martyrs, is the theme of a touching ballad sung all over the northern districts of Madras, which relates how a husband murdered his own wife rather than give their daughter in marriage to anybody but his sister's son. The custom thus sanctified by immemorial usage, by poetry, and by the holy book, retains to this day a strong hold on the hearts of the Komatis. Even yet a man who violates it in the caste, or indeed in any caste addicted to the custom, is looked down upon. Such conduct is usually described as bending the twig from its natural course; and it is believed that just as such a twig must waste away and die, so the parties who contract such marriages cannot prosper.[2] True it is, that of late years some Komatis have broken away from the ancient custom; but common folk look at them askance, and allege that these transgressors have suffered for their sin in the death of their sons-in-law and in other misfortunes.[3]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Tottiyans.

Among the Tottiyans, a caste of Telugu cultivators, "the custom of marrying boys to their paternal aunt's or maternal uncle's daughter, however old she may be, also obtains, and in such cases the bridegroom's father is said to take upon himself the duty of begetting children to his own son."[4] According to another account, in this caste "a man has the usual claim to his paternal aunt's daughter, and so rigorously is this rule followed that boys of tender years are frequently married to grown women. These latter are allowed to consort with their husband's near relations, and the boy is held to be the father of any children which may be born."[5] From these accounts we gather that a Tottiyan may marry

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 314-319.

[2] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 325.

[3] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 54.

[4] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 181; E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 184.

[5] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vii. 191, quoting the Gazetteer of the Madura District.

either the daughter of his father's sister or the daughter of his mother's brother; but that marriage with the father's sister's daughter is preferred, her male cousin, the son of her mother's brother, being held to have a legitimate claim to her hand. On the contrary, among the Medas or Medaras, a caste of workers in bamboo in the Telugu, Canarese, Oriya, and Tamil countries, a man most frequently marries the daughter of his mother's brother, and less frequently the daughter of his father's sister.[1] Among the Silavantulus of Vizagapatam, a religious sect who seem to be an offshoot of the Pattu Sales, Telugu-speaking weavers, the custom of *mēnarikam* is observed, in virtue of which a man usually marries the daughter of his mother's brother; indeed so strong is his claim on the hand of this particular cousin, that if his mother's brother happens to have no daughter, he is bound to find another wife for his nephew.[2] Similarly among the Muka Doras, a Telugu-speaking class of cultivators, who are traditionally regarded as one of the primitive hill tribes, "the *mēnarikam* system is in force, according to which a man should marry his maternal uncle's daughter."[3] The same rule which prescribes marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother as the most proper that a man can contract is observed also by the Telugu castes of the Bagatas, Gudalas, Kamsalas, Malas, Nagaralus, Salapus, and Viramushtis.[4]

The Medas or Medaras.

The Silavantulus.

The Muka Doras.

Among the Telugu- or Canarese-speaking castes of Mysore marriage with a niece, the daughter of a sister, is often allowed as an alternative, or even preferred to, marriage with a cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister. Thus among the Agasas, who speak either Telugu or Canarese according to their place of residence, in marriages "the relationship of maternal uncle's or paternal aunt's daughter is preferred. Marriage with an elder sister's daughter is not only allowed, but it is specially favoured. . . . Marriage with a younger sister's daughter is prohibited."[5] Similarly among the Vaddas, a rude, illiterate,

Custom in Mysore of marrying either a cross-cousin or a niece, the daughter of a sister. The Agasas.

The Vaddas.

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 52, 55.

[2] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* vi. 387. As to the Pattu Sales, see E. Thurston, *op. cit.* vi. 265.

[3] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* v. 103, 104.

[4] E. Thurston, *op. cit.* i. 129 *sq.*, ii. 301, iii. 146, iv. 371, v. 136, vi. 264, vii. 407.

[5] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, iv. *Agasa Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), pp. 5 *sq.*

Telugu-speaking caste of Mysore, in choosing a wife preference is given to a near relation, such as the daughter of the father's sister, the daughter of the mother's brother, or the daughter of an elder sister.[1] Again, among the Nayindas, who speak Telugu in some parts of Mysore and Canarese in others, a man is free to wed the daughter of his mother's brother, or the daughter of his father's sister, or the daughter of his own elder sister; but of these three marriages the third, with a niece, is the most popular. But the niece whom a man marries should be, as usual, the daughter of his elder sister; only in cases of extreme necessity, such as that of a widower who cannot find a suitable mate, is marriage with a younger sister's daughter tolerated. "When a man has married a daughter of his sister, his son is not allowed to marry either a daughter of that sister or of other sisters, for though before the father's marriage they were eligible as his paternal aunt's daughters, they become the equals of his mother's sisters after that event."[2] So among the Morasu Okkalus, who speak both Telugu and Canarese, marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, or the daughter of a father's sister, or the daughter of a man's own elder sister is specially favoured; but except in extreme cases, such as that of widowers, a man may not marry his younger sister's daughter.[3] Among the Sanyasis, a Telugu-speaking caste of itinerant mendicants, an elder sister's daughter is preferred as a wife to any other; but if a man has no such niece to wed, he puts up with a cousin, the daughter either of his father's sister or of his mother's brother, as second best.[4] The Madigas, who, along with the Holeyas, are sometimes called "black people," are a low caste of Mysore, and are believed to represent the earliest stratum of the inhabitants of the country, who have settled in towns and villages. In appearance they are short, dark, and muscular, with somewhat flattened noses. They speak either Telugu or Canarese according to the place of their abode. Among them, the

The Nayindas.

The Morasu Okkalus.

The Sanyasis.

The Madigas,

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xi. *Vadda Caste* (Bangalore, 1907), pp. 1, 4.

[2] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xii. *Nayinda Caste* (Bangalore, 1907), pp. 5 *sq.*

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xv. *Morasu Okkalu* (Bangalore, 1908), p. 13.

[4] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xvi. *Sanyasi Caste* (Bangalore, 1908), pp. 1, 2.

most suitable marriage which a man can contract is that with the daughter of his own elder sister, or with the daughter of his mother's brother, or with the daughter of his father's sister. But while marriage with these cousins is thought most suitable, marriage with other cousins, the daughters either of a father's brother or of a mother's sister, is absolutely prohibited, for these cousins are counted equivalent to a man's sisters.[1] Among the Holeyas, an outcaste race of Mysore, who rank, however, a little above the Madigas, the marriage rule is similar. A man generally marries either the daughter of his own elder sister, or the daughter of his father's sister, or the daughter of his mother's brother. But he may not marry his younger sister's daughter, unless no other wife can be found for him.[2] The Gollas are an illiterate caste of Mysore, whose original language seems to have been Telugu, though some of them now speak Canarese. Their original calling appears to have been the tending of cattle and the sale of milk and other dairy produce. But most of them have abandoned their ancestral vocation, and now earn their livelihood as farmers or day-labourers. They allow marriage with a cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister; but they forbid marriage with a cousin, the daughter either of a father's brother or of a mother's sister, for they regard such a cousin as equal to a sister and marriage with her as incestuous.[3] Similarly among the Devangas, a caste of weavers in Mysore, some of whom speak Telugu and others Canarese, a man may marry his cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother or the daughters of his father's sister; but he may not marry his cousins, the daughters of his father's brother or the daughters of his mother's sister, for these cousins are esteemed his sisters. However, in this caste the most proper wife for a man is his niece, the

The Holeyas.

The Gollas.

The Devangas.

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xvii. *Madiga Caste* (Bangalore, 1909), pp. 1, 2, 3, 11.

[2] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, ii. *Holeya Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), pp. 1, 7. Some groups of Holeyas speak Telugu, others speak Canarese, and some are of Tamil origin (*id.* pp. 4 *sq.*). As to the social superiority of the Holeyas to the Madigas, see *id.*, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xvii. *Madiga Caste*, p. 1.

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xx. *Golla Caste* (Bangalore, 1910), pp. 1, 4, 6.

daughter of his elder sister; but the daughter of a younger sister he is forbidden to marry.[1] Similarly among the Nagartas and Upparas, two other castes of Mysore, some of whom speak Telugu and others Canarese, marriage with an elder sister's daughter is allowed, but marriage with a younger sister's daughter is prohibited. Some of the Nagartas even prefer an elder sister's daughter as a wife to any other.[2] The Mondarus, a Telugu caste of beggars in Mysore, allow marriage, to all appearance indifferently, either with the daughter of an elder sister, or with the daughter of a mother's brother, or with the daughter of a father's sister.[3] The Kurubas, a large shepherd caste of Mysore, whose native language is Canarese, particularly recommend marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, but marriage with the daughter of a mother's sister they, as usual, forbid. They also permit a man to marry his niece, the daughter of his elder sister; nay, in some places, such as Kolar and Bowringpet, they allow him to marry the daughter of a younger sister, which is quite contrary to the ordinary rule.[4] Among the Milas, a fishing caste in Ganjam and Vizagapatam, the custom of *mēnarikam*, according to which a man should marry his mother's brother's daughter, is in force; but he is also free to marry his own sister's daughter.[5] Whether he is at liberty to marry the daughter of his younger sister, we are not told. To judge by analogy, his choice is probably restricted to the daughters of his elder sister. Similarly, among the Gavaras, a Telugu-speaking caste in the Vizagapatam district, "the custom of *mēnarikam*, by which a man marries his maternal uncle's daughter, is in force, and it is said that he may also marry his sister's daughter,"[6] and exactly the same customs as to marriage with a cousin or a niece are reported to prevail

The Nagartas and Upparas.

The Mondarus.

The Kurubas.

The Milas.

The Gavaras.

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxxiv. *Dēvāngas* (Bangalore, 1914), pp. 1, 5.

[2] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxi. *Uppara Caste* (Bangalore, 1910), p. 4; *id.*, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxx. *Nagartās* (Bangalore, 1913), p. 6.

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxiii. *Mondaru Caste* (Bangalore, 1911), pp. 1, 2.

[4] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, i. *Kuruba Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), pp. 1, 8.

[5] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 63.

[6] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, ii. 278.

among the Chinna Kondalus, a caste of hill cultivators in Vizagapatam, who appear to be related to the Khonds, though they speak the Telugu language and have adopted Telugu customs.[1] But whether in these cases a man is free to take to wife the daughter of his younger sister, or is limited to the daughter of his elder sister, we are not informed. The Chinna Kondalus.

From many of the foregoing instances it appears that the custom of marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, is not confined to those branches of the Dravidian race which speak the Tamil and Telugu languages, but that it is also practised by castes which speak the Canarese or, as it is sometimes called, the Kannada tongue.[2] Among the Kappiliyans, who are Canarese-speaking farmers in Madura and Tinnevelly, a man's right to marry his cousin, the daughter of his father's sister, is so rigorously insisted upon that, as among the Tottiyans, ill-assorted matches are common. A woman, whose cousin husband is too young to perform his marital duties, is allowed to consort with his near relations, and the children begotten by such intercourse are treated as his.[3] Precisely the same custom is observed, with the same results as to the paternity of the children fathered on the youthful husband, among the Anuppans, another caste of Canarese farmers, who are found chiefly in the districts of Madura, Tinnevelly, and Coimbatore.[4] Cross-cousin marriage in the Canarese-speaking branch of the Dravidian race. The Kappiliyans. The Anuppans.

In Southern India the practice of marriage with a cross-cousin is not limited to those aboriginal castes and tribes which speak one or other of the languages belonging to the Dravidian family. It is observed also by a number of castes or tribes which speak Oriya, an Indo-Aryan language confined to Orissa and the adjoining parts of Madras and the Central Provinces.[5] For example, among the Godagulas, a Cross-cousin marriage among Oriya-speaking castes of Southern India. The Godagulas.

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 351.

[2] On Canarese (Kannada), as a branch of Dravidian speech, see *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire*, i. (Oxford, 1909) pp. 380 *sq.* It is the language of Mysore and of the neighbouring portion of the Ghaut country, including the southern corner of the Bombay Presidency. Like Tamil and Telugu, it possesses an ancient literature.

[3] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iii. 215, 217.

[4] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i. 49, 50.

[5] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), i. 376.

caste of workers in bamboo who speak Oriya, "the custom of *mēnarikam*, according to which a man should marry his maternal uncle's daughter, is so rigidly enforced that, if the uncle refuses to give his daughter in marriage, the man has a right to carry her off, and then pay a fine, the amount of which is fixed by the caste council. A portion thereof is given to the girl's parents, and the remainder spent on a caste feast. If the maternal uncle has no daughter, a man may, according to the *ēduru* (or reversed) *mēnarikam* custom, marry his paternal aunt's daughter."[1] This account is instructive, since it shows that in this caste marriage with the daughter of a father's sister is only permitted in default of a daughter of a mother's brother, who is regarded as a man's proper wife.

The Bavuris.

Among the Bavuris or Bauris, a low class of Oriya basket-makers living in Ganjam, a man is forbidden to marry the daughter of his father's sister, while he is allowed, as usual, to marry the daughter of his mother's brother.[2]

The Paidis.

Again, among the Paidis, a class of cultivators and traders in Vizagapatam, who speak a corrupt dialect of Oriya, "the *mēnarikam* custom is in force, according to which a man should marry his maternal uncle's daughter. If he does so, the bride-price (*vōli*) is fixed at five rupees; otherwise it is ten rupees."[3]

Economic advantage of marriage with a cross-cousin.

Thus a man gets his cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, at half-price, which no doubt to a thrifty man is a great inducement to marry her. However, regarded as a bargain, even this reduction in price compares disadvantageously with the practice, or at least, the theory of the Komatis, who, according to the injunction of their scriptures, should let a man have his cousin for nothing.[4] We may suspect that this represents the original practice in the marriage of cousins, and that one great secret of the immense popularity of such marriages was their cheapness; for any other woman a man had to pay more or less heavily, but for a female cousin of the proper kind he had to pay

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, ii. 282. According to the Indian Census Report of 1901 (vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis, p. 154), the Godagulas (Godugalas) are identified with the Gudalas, a Telugu caste of basket-makers. But this is denied by Mr. C. Hayavadana Rao, whose account of the caste is reproduced by Mr. E. Thurston.

[2] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i. 175, 177.

[3] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 455.

[4] See above, p. 111.

little or nothing. In her case the passion of love was reinforced by the spirit of economy.

Cross-cousin marriage in other Oriya castes.

Other Oriya castes prefer marriage with the daughter of a father's sister to marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother. Thus, among the Bhumias, Bottadas, Bodo, Malis, Omanaitos, and Pentiyas, all cultivators, a man has the right to claim the hand of his father's sister's daughter in marriage.[1]

Cross-cousin marriage among Brahmans in Southern India.

In Southern India the practice of marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, seems to have spread even to Brahmans, or at all events to classes which claim to rank as Brahmans. We are told that "the custom has apparently been copied by the Dēsāsta Brāhmans of Southern India, in whom it would, but for modern enlightenment, have almost been crystallised into law. The Ayyar Brāhmans have adopted it in order to keep the family property intact within it."[2] The adoption of cousin-marriage by the Desasta or Deshasth Brahmans of Southern India is all the more remarkable, because in the Deccan these Brahmans "form a community believed to represent the oldest stock that migrated to the south and got mixed in various ways with the Dravidian races by long intercourse extending over centuries. They retain the oldest records of the Hindu texts and speak a language closely allied to Sanskrit. Their rules of exogamy are so complicated that it would be difficult to believe in them except for the assurance that any breach directly involves excommunication from the parent stock."[3] Among the Shivalli Brahmans of South Canara "a maternal uncle's daughter can be married without consulting any horoscope, and during the marriage ceremonies it is customary for a bridegroom's sister to obtain from him a formal promise

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i. 238, 265, iv. 441, v. 444, vi. 190. This may be the custom also among the Ronas, another Oriya caste of cultivators, as to whom we are told that among them "it is customary for a man to marry his paternal uncle's daughter" (E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, vi. 258). In this passage "paternal uncle's" is almost certainly a mistake either for "paternal aunt's" or for "maternal uncle's," more probably, perhaps, for the former.

[2] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India*, p. 54.

[3] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. i. *India, Ethnographic Appendices* (Calcutta, 1903), p. 114.

that, if he has a daughter, he will give her in marriage to her son."[1] Among the Konkani Brahmans of Cochin, "the marriage to a paternal aunt's daughter or to a maternal uncle's daughter, though not sanctioned by the *Smritis* and though not prevalent among other branches of Gauda Saraswata Brahmans, has in imitation of the Dravida Brahmans been introduced. But such marriages do not at all amount to an injunction. The marriage to one's sister's daughter, which obtains among Desastha and Karnataka Brahmans, is not in vogue among the Gauda Saraswata Brahmans."[2] In the South Maratha country of the Bombay Presidency thirty-one castes allow a man to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister; three allow him to marry also the daughter of his mother's sister; and fifteen allow him to marry the daughter of his mother's brother, but no other first cousins.[3]

Cross-cousin marriage in Central and Northern India.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Gonds.

When we pass from Southern to Central and Northern India we find that the custom of cross-cousin marriage, though by no means so prevalent, is still practised in these regions by some tribes, particularly by those of Dravidian or other non-Aryan origin. Thus among the Gonds of the Central Provinces, who are the principal tribe of the Dravidian family, and perhaps the most important of the non-Aryan or forest tribes in India,[4] "the marriage of first cousins is considered especially suitable. Formerly, perhaps, the match between a brother's daughter and a sister's son was most common; this is held to be a survival of the matriarchate, when a man's sister's son was his heir. But the reason has now been generally forgotten, and the union of a brother's son to a sister's daughter has also become customary, while, as girls are scarce and have to be paid for, it is the boy's father who puts forward his claim. Thus in Mandla and Bastar a man thinks he has a right to his sister's daughter for his son on the ground that his family

[1] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, i. 382, quoting H. A. Stuart, *Manual of the South Canara District*.

[2] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes* (Madras, 1909–1912), ii. 349.

[3] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. vii. *Bombay*, Part i. *Report*, by P. J. Mead and G. Laird Macgregor (Bombay, 1912), p. 122.

[4] In 1911 the Gonds numbered three millions and were increasing rapidly. See R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), iii. 41.

has given a girl to her husband's family, and therefore they should give one back. This match is known as *Dūdh lautāna* or bringing back the milk; and if the sister's daughter marries any one else her maternal uncle sometimes claims what is known as 'milk money,' which may be a sum of Rs. 5, in compensation for the loss of the girl as a wife for his son. This custom has perhaps developed out of the former match in changed conditions of society, when the original relation between a brother and his sister's son has been forgotten and girls have become valuable. But it is said that the *dūdh* or milk money is also payable if a brother refuses to give his daughter to his sister's son. In Mandla a man claims his sister's daughter for his son and sometimes even the daughter of a cousin, and considers that he has a legitimate grievance if the girl is married to somebody else. Frequently, if he has reason to apprehend this, he invites the girl to his house for some ceremony or festival, and there marries her to his son without the consent of her parents."[1] Similarly among the Gonds of the Madras Presidency, in the Eastern Ghauts, "the most usual thing for a man is to marry his own paternal aunt's daughter," and the writer who reports the custom adds that "one reason of this is possibly the incurring of less marriage expenses, a bride amongst these tribes and castes being rated at very heavy prices."[2]

Growing tendency among the Gonds to prefer marriage with a father's sister's daughter.

From these accounts we may perhaps infer that, while Gonds allow and even favour marriage with the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, there is a growing tendency among them to prefer the marriage with the daughter of a father's sister, because, in the scarcity of marriageable girls, who have ordinarily to be paid for, a father is more anxious to get his niece for nothing for his son than to give his daughter for nothing to his nephew. Thus purely economic considerations appear to exercise a strong influence on the change from the one form of cousin marriage to the other.

Among the Bhunjias, a small Dravidian tribe of the

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 71.

[2] C. Hayavadana Rao, "The Gonds of the Eastern Ghauts, India," *Anthropos*, v. (1910) p. 794.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Bhunjias.

Central Provinces, both forms of cross-cousin marriage are allowed; for we read that in the tribe "a special tie exists between a man and his sister's children. The marriage of a brother's son or daughter to a sister's daughter or son is considered the most suitable. A man will not allow his sister's children to eat the leavings of food on his plate, though his own children may do so. This is a special token of respect to his sister's children. He will not chastise his sister's children, even though they deserve it. And it is considered especially meritorious for a man to pay for the wedding ceremony of his sister's son or daughter."[1]

The Kamars.

Similarly among the Kamars, a small Dravidian tribe who claim to be aborigines of the Central Provinces, "as among some of the other primitive tribes, a man stands in a special relation to his sister's children. The marriage of his children with his sister's children is considered as the most suitable union. If a man's sister is poor he will arrange for the wedding of her children. He will never beat his sister's children, however much they may deserve it, and he will not permit his sister's son or daughter to eat from the dish from which he eats. This special connection between a maternal uncle and his nephew is held to be a survival of the matriarchate, when a man stood in the place a father now occupies to his sister's children, the real father having nothing to do with them."[2]

The Sonjharas.

The Sonjharas or Jharas, a small caste of gold-washers in the Central Provinces, "permit the intermarriage of the children of a brother and a sister, but not of those of two sisters, though their husbands may be of different septs."[3]

The Dhobas.

Similarly among the Dhobas, an offshoot of a primitive tribe in the Central Provinces, whose facial features resemble those of the Gonds, "the children of brothers and sisters may marry, but not those of two sisters, because a man's maternal aunt or *mausi* is considered as equivalent to his mother."[4]

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, ii. 326 *sq.*

[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 325. On the close relationship in India between a man and his sister's children, especially in connexion with the marriage of the sister's children, see W. H. R. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, pp. 629 *sqq.*

[3] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iv. 510.

[4] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* ii. 515, 516.

The Gandas.

So, too, among the Gandas, a servile and impure caste in the Central Provinces, marriage between cousins, the children of two sisters, is forbidden, but marriage between cousins, the children of brothers and sisters, is permitted.[1] In all these cases, apparently, a man is free to marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister, and no indication is given of a preference for the one marriage over the other.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Bhatras.

The Bhatras, a primitive Dravidian tribe, akin to the Gonds, in the Bastar State of the Central Provinces, think that a man has a right to marry the daughter of his mother's brother, and in former days, if the girl was refused by her parents, he carried her off and married her by force.[2]

The Manas.

Among the Manas, a Dravidian caste of cultivators and labourers in the Central Provinces, "the practice of marrying a brother's daughter to a sister's son is a very favourite one, being known as *Māhunchār*, and in this respect the Mānas resemble the Gonds."[3]

The Halbas.

Similarly among the Halbas, a mixed caste of cultivators and farm-servants in the Central Provinces, "a match which is commonly arranged where practicable is that of a brother's daughter to a sister's son. And a man always shows a special regard and respect for his sister's son, touching his feet as to a superior, while, whenever he desires to make a gift as an offering of thanks or atonement or as a meritorious action, the sister's son is the recipient. At his death he usually leaves a substantial legacy, such as one or two buffaloes, to his sister's son, the remainder of the property going to his own family. This recognition of a special relationship is probably a survival of the matriarchate, when property descended through women, and a sister's son would be his uncle's heir. Thus a man would naturally desire to marry his daughter to his nephew in order that she might participate in his property, and hence arose the custom of making this match, which is still the most favoured among the Halbas and Gonds, though the reasons which led to it have been forgotten for several centuries."[4]

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 15.

[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* ii. 271, 274.

[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iv. 175.

[4] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 189 *sq.*

Economic motive for preferring marriage with a mother's brother's daughter.

Thus, whereas among the Gonds a man may marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, but the marriage with the father's sister's daughter is apparently coming into vogue, the Bhatras, Manas, and Halbas, on the other hand, still prefer the marriage of a man with his mother's brother's daughter, or, in other words, the marriage of a woman with her father's sister's son, and this preference may, as Mr. Russell points out, date from a time when a man's heir was his sister's son, and when, accordingly, a father might naturally desire to give his daughter in marriage to his sister's son as his heir, in order that she might share the property which would descend to her husband from his maternal uncle, her father. Hence it appears that under the particular form of mother-kin in which a man's heir is his sister's son, a father has an economic motive for marrying his daughter to his sister's son.

Marriage with a father's sister's daughter forbidden in some castes of the Central Provinces.

In not a few castes or tribes of the Central Provinces the preference for marriage with the daughter of the mother's brother is so decided that they positively forbid marriage with the daughter of the father's sister; and as marriages with other cousins, the daughters of a mother's sister or of a father's brother, are regularly barred, it follows that in these tribes the only marriage between cousins which is tolerated is that between a brother's daughter and a sister's son.

Among the Kunbis, while marriage with a father's sister's daughter is forbidden, marriage with a mother's brother's daughter is almost obligatory.

This rule holds good, for example, of the Kunbis, the great agricultural caste of Berar and the Central Provinces, whose internal structure seems to show that they are a mixed body recruited from different classes of the community, but with Gond blood in their veins. Among them marriages between first and second cousins are prohibited, "except that a sister's son may be married to a brother's daughter. Such marriages are also favoured by the Marātha Brahmans and other castes, and the suitability of the match is expressed in the saying *Āto ghari bhāsi sūn*, or 'At a sister's house her brother's daughter is a daughter-in-law.' The sister claims it as a right and not unfrequently there are quarrels if the brother decides to give his daughter to somebody else, while the general feeling is so strongly in favour of these marriages that the caste committee some-

times imposes a fine on fathers who wish to break through the rule. The fact that in this single case the marriage of near relatives is not only permitted but considered almost as an obligation, while in all other instances it is strictly prohibited, probably points to the conclusion that the custom is a survival of the matriarchate, when a brother's property would pass to his sister's son. Under such a law of inheritance he would naturally desire that his heir should be united to his own daughter, and this union might gradually become customary and at length almost obligatory. The custom in this case may survive when the reasons which justified it have entirely vanished. And while formerly it was the brother who would have had reason to desire the match for his daughter, it is now the sister who insists on it for her son, the explanation being that among the Kunbis as with other agricultural castes, to whom a wife's labour is a valuable asset, girls are expensive and a considerable price has to be paid for a bride."[1]

Two different economic motives for preferring marriage with a mother's brother's daughter.

From Mr. Russell's instructive account of cousin marriages in the Gond and Kunbi castes respectively, we gather that among the Gonds a father desires and claims the marriage of his son with his sister's daughter, and that among the Kunbis a mother desires and claims the marriage of her son with her brother's daughter, the desire and the claim in both cases being based on the economic motive of bringing that expensive article, a daughter-in-law, into the family for nothing. Thus, while interest moves a father to promote one form of cross-cousin marriage, namely, the marriage of a man with his father's sister's daughter,[2] it simultaneously moves a mother to promote the other form of cross-cousin marriage, namely, the marriage of a man with his mother's brother's daughter; so that the same motives pulling brother and sister in opposite directions in a sense balance each other and tend to produce an equilibrium between the two forms of cross-cousin marriage. For it is to be observed that, where the economic motive is in play, it will not act in one way in one tribe, and in another way

The same economic motive, viz., the wish to get a daughter-in-law cheap, induces a father to favour the one form of cross-cousin-marriage (that with a father's sister's daughter) and induces a mother to favour the other form of cross-cousin marriage (that with a mother's brother's daughter).

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iv. 22 *sq.*

[2] See above, p. 120, in regard to the Gonds.

in another tribe; in every tribe the pecuniary interests of brother and sister in respect of the marriage of their children will be diametrically opposed to each other, the brother always seeking his sister's daughter as a wife for his son, and the sister always seeking her brother's daughter as a wife for her son, so that within the limits of the same tribe similar motives will draw brother and sister in opposite directions and tend to balance each other. The result will be that both forms of cross-cousin marriage (the marriage with a mother's brother's daughter and the marriage with a father's sister's daughter) will probably survive for a long time side by side in the same tribe without the one being able to oust the other. And this is exactly what is observed to happen among many castes or tribes of India at the present day.[1]

In the Central Provinces marriage with a mother's brother's daughter is preferred to marriage with a father's sister's daughter.

The Gowaris are the herdsman or grazier caste of the Maratha country in the Central Provinces. They appear to be of mixed origin, being sprung from a union of forest Gonds with Ahirs, a caste of cowherds and milkmen, who are believed to have been descended from a tribe which entered India from Central Asia about the beginning of the Christian era. Among the Gowaris the rule is, that a man may marry his daughter to his sister's son, but may not take her daughter as a wife for his son.[2] In other words, the Gowaris allow a man to marry his cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, but forbid him to marry his cousin, the daughter of his father's sister. Thus they permit the one form of cross-cousin marriage but not the other. A similar permission, accompanied by a similar prohibition, is found among other castes or tribes of the Central Provinces, such as the Agharias, Andhs, Bahnas, Kaikaris, Kharias, Kohlis, Chandnahe Kurmis, Mahars, and Marathas.[3] Taken to-

[1] After noticing some cases in which the marriage with a mother's brother's daughter is allowed, and other cases in which the marriage with a father's sister's daughter is allowed, Dr. Rivers observes, "Much more frequently marriage is allowed with the daughter either of the maternal uncle or of the paternal aunt, though, as we have seen, there is sometimes in these cases a preference for the former." See W. H. R. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, p. 627.

[2] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 160 *sq.*, 162. As to the Ahirs, see R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* ii. 18 *sqq.*

[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* ii. 10, 39, 71, iii. 298, 447 *sq.*, 495, iv. 60, 133, 203.

gether with the foregoing evidence, this seems to indicate that in the Central Provinces the balance of opinion inclines decidedly in favour of marrying a mother's brother's daughter rather than a father's sister's daughter.

But the Gollas of the Central Provinces prefer marriage with a father's sister's daughter.

However, the Gonds appear not to be the only people of these provinces among whom the balance of opinion is apparently swinging in the opposite direction, namely, in favour of marriage with a father's sister's daughter. The Gollas or Golars are the great shepherd caste of the Telugu country, numbering a million and a half of persons in Madras and Hyderabad.[1] We have seen that in Mysore they allow marriage either with the daughter of the mother's brother or with the daughter of the father's sister.[2] There are some thousands of them in the Central Provinces, where they still follow their ancestral vocation, living as nomadic herdsmen in the large pasture lands of the Balaghat district. Here they seem, like the Gonds, to tend towards a preference for marriage with the father's sister's daughter; at least this is suggested by Mr. Russell's account of cousin marriage among them. He says, "The children of brothers and sisters are allowed to marry, but not those of two sisters, the reason stated for this prohibition being that during the absence of the mother her sister nurses her children; the children of sisters are therefore often foster brothers and sisters, and this is considered as equivalent to the real relationship. But the marriage of a brother's son to a sister's daughter is held, as among the Gonds, to be a most suitable union."[3] In this account the reason assigned for prohibiting the marriage between cousins who are the children of sisters is no doubt an afterthought; the original motive for the prohibition, as we shall see presently, lies much deeper.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Kotvalias of Baroda.

The Kotvalias, a dark non-Aryan tribe of Baroda, allow marriage with the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, but forbid marriage with the daughter either of a mother's sister or of a father's brother.[4] Among the

[1] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 35. Compare E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, ii. 284 *sqq.*

[2] Above, p. 115.

[3] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, iii. 35 *sq.*

[4] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xviii. *Baroda*, Part i. *Report*, by Jamshedji Ardêshir Dalal (Bombay, 1902), p. 508.

Mohammedans, Parsees, and Christians of Baroda there is no prejudice against marriages between first cousins, indeed, an orthodox Parsee deems it a duty to bring about such marriages in his household; but a Hindoo looks upon such connexions with horror.[1]

Cross-cousin marriage among Dravidian tribes of Mirzapur.

Passing still farther north, we find the marriage of cross-cousins allowed, if not favoured, among a few castes or tribes of Mirzapur, which appear to be mostly of Dravidian origin. Thus, among the Ghasiyas, a Dravidian tribe in the hill country of Mirzapur, a man may marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister.[2] On the other hand, the Cheros, a Dravidian race of labourers and cultivators in the hill country of Mirzapur, according to one account seem to allow of marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, but forbid marriage with the daughter of a father's sister.[3] The same permission and the same prohibition are recorded of the Irakis and Kunjras, two other castes of Mirzapur.[4] Among the Manjhis, or Majhwars, an aboriginal tribe of Dravidian origin in the hill country of South Mirzapur, the more primitive members of the community "adhere to the old Gond rule by which first cousins, provided they are not the offspring of two sisters, by preference intermarry."[5] This statement is, perhaps, to be corrected, so as to run, "first cousins, provided they are not the offspring of two sisters *or of two brothers*"; since the prohibition for cousins, the children of two brothers, to marry each other commonly goes with the prohibition for cousins, the children of two sisters, to marry each other. If the statement thus corrected be accepted, it will follow that the more primitive members of this Dravidian

[1] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xviii. *Baroda*, Part i. *Report*, by Jamshedji Ardêshir Dalal (Bombay, 1902), p. 490.

[2] W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Calcutta, 1896), ii. 412.

[3] W. Crooke, *op. cit.* ii. 217. Mr. Crooke's statement is not clear. He says, "Their custom of exogamy even is uncertain. By one account first cousins on the father's side cannot intermarry, while marriage of cousins on the mother's side is permitted, and a paternal uncle's son can marry a maternal uncle's daughter, but not *vice versa*." Here "a paternal uncle's son" seems to be a mistake for "a paternal aunt's son." Dr. Rivers understands the passage as I do ("The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, p. 626).

[4] W. Crooke, *op. cit.* iii. 2, 345.

[5] W. Crooke, *op. cit.* iii. 417.

tribe follow the old custom which allows, or rather recommends and enjoins, a man to marry his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister. Further inquiry in the tribe might perhaps elicit a preference for one or other of these two forms of cross-cousin marriage.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Bhotiyas of the Almora District in the United Provinces.

The practice of cross-cousin marriage is in vogue among the Bhotiyas, who inhabit the Almora district of the United Provinces, not far from the borders of Nepaul and Tibet. These people speak a language allied to Tibetan, and the cast of their countenances is plainly Mongolian; but though they are undoubtedly of Tibetan origin, they have to a great extent adopted Brahman customs and the Brahman religion. They draw a sharp distinction between ortho-cousins (the children of two brothers or of two sisters) and cross-cousins (the children of a brother and a sister respectively), and they apply quite different names to them. A man regards his brother's children as his own and calls them his sons and daughters; and a woman regards her sister's children as her own and calls them her sons and daughters. Consistently with this view and this nomenclature the sons of two brothers call each other, not cousins, but brothers; and the sons of two sisters call each other, not cousins, but brothers. Hence the children of two brothers may not marry each other, since they are related to each other as brothers and sisters; and the children of two sisters may not marry each other, since in like manner they are related to each other as brothers and sisters. But cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, stand on quite a different footing: a man does not look on his sister's children as his own, nor call them his sons and daughters; a woman does not look on her brother's children as her own, nor call them her sons and daughters; and these cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, are quite free to marry each other, indeed such marriages are the rule among the Bhotiyas of the Almora district.[1]

In the Punjab cases of cousin marriage seem to be few

[1] Panna Lall, "An enquiry into the Birth and Marriage customs of the Khasiyas and the Bhottiyas of Almora district, U. P.," *The Indian Antiquary*, xl. (1911) pp. 191, 193-196. As to the Bhotiyas, see further, W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, ii. 61 *sqq.*

Cross-cousin marriage in the Punjab.

and far between; nor is this to be wondered at, when we remember that the Punjab was in all probability the part of India which the immigrant Aryans first occupied, and from which they expelled most thoroughly those aboriginal tribes who observed the custom of cousin marriage. However, the custom of marrying either the daughter of a mother's brother or the daughter of a father's sister is very common in Kulu, a Himalayan district of the Punjab.[1] Among the Orakzais, who are Pathans by race and Mohammedans by religion, "it is a common practice for a man to marry his first cousin, in which case an exchange of betrothals is generally effected."[2] Again, among the Khands, an agricultural clan in Shahpur, who are Mohammedans, marriage "is permissible between cousins german."[3] However, in these latter cases it may well be that the marriage of cousins is a recent institution, due to Mohammedan influence rather than an ancient custom which has survived from a time before the invasion of India by the Aryans. In the North-West Frontier Province, which borders the Punjab on the north-west, and in which Mohammedans are in a great majority and Hindoos in a small minority, "the Mohammedan Law provides a wide field for selection among relations, and close marriages are very common. Throughout the Province marriages are usually determined by considerations of family convenience. For instance, a man wanting to marry his son arranges to take for him the daughter of his brother or his cousin, agreeing to give his own daughter in exchange after a year or two."[4] Among the Brahuis of Baluchistan marriage with a cousin, the daughter of a father's

Cousin-marriage among the Mohammedans of the North-West Frontier Province.

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, "The Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, July 1907, p. 628 (referring to Ibbetson, *Rep. Panjab Census, 1881*, vol. i. p. 366); *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 256.

[2] H. A. Rose, *Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, iii. (Lahore, 1914) p. 180.

[3] H. A. Rose, *op. cit.* ii. (Lahore, 1911) p. 492.

[4] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. xiii. *North-West Frontier Province*, by C. Latimer (Peshawar, 1912), p. 141. "The Hindus in the Province (and in speaking of Hindus I refer also to Sikhs) form a small community, isolated, though to a less degree than in the past, from the great body of their co-religionists to the East and South" (*op. cit.* p. 143). Marriage with all cousins is permitted by the Koran (chapter iv. vol. i. pp. 75 *sq.* of E. H. Palmer's translation, Oxford, 1880, *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. vi.). As to cousin marriage among the Arabs, see below, pp. 255 *sqq.*

brother, is deemed the best of all.[1] And among the Mohammedans of India in general the marriage of first cousins, whether they are the children of two brothers or of two sisters, or of a brother and a sister, is considered very suitable; in default of a cousin, an alliance is preferred with some family with which there have already been marriage relations.[2] On the contrary, in the North-West Frontier Province, "with the Hindus the objection to close marriages seems to be particularly strong. Among Mohammedans such marriages, as we have seen, are very common; but the Hindu speaks with the greatest contempt of their practice in this respect. One may conjecture, therefore, that the objection is something racial, something too deep-seated to be affected by accidents of environment."[3]

Cross-cousin marriage among the aboriginal tribes of Bengal.

When we leave the north-west of India, the earliest seat of the Aryan race in the peninsula, and move eastward to Bengal, we again find the practice of cross-cousin marriage surviving among some of the aboriginal tribes. For example, among the Khoras, a small caste of Chota Nagpur, who, though Hindoos by religion, appear to be Gonds, and therefore Dravidians by blood, a man is free to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, a custom which Sir Herbert Risley, contrasting it with the ordinary Hindoo usage, describes as "a departure from the ordinary rules which strikes one as curious."[4] Again, the Kaurs of Chota Nagpur, whose dark complexion, broad noses, wide mouths, and thick lips appear to betray their Dravidian origin, observe much the same prohibited degrees as the Hindoos, but nevertheless allow a man to marry the daughter of his mother's brother.[5] Further, among the Karans, an indigenous caste of writers in Orissa, "prohibited degrees are reckoned by the method in vogue among the higher Hindu castes, with the curious exception that a man is permitted to marry his

[1] Denys Bray, *The Life-History of a Brāhūi* (London, 1913), p. 34. The reason assigned by the writer for the custom is that so the stock is kept pure.

[2] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 252.

[3] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. xiii. *North-West Frontier Province*, by C. Latimer (Peshawar, 1912), p. 145.

[4] (Sir) H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1892), i. 347.

[5] (Sir) H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, i. 435, 436.

maternal uncle's daughter, an alliance distinctly forbidden by the ordinary rules."[1] The Rabhas, of the Goalpara district in Eastern Bengal, allow a man to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister.[2] These instances suggest that the old custom of cross-cousin marriage, especially the marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, was too firmly implanted in the blood of the aboriginal tribes to be at once extirpated by the influence of an alien race, whose matrimonial customs in other respects they adopted.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Mongoloid tribes of Chittagong and Assam.

Passing still eastward we leave the Dravidian race behind, and approaching the eastern borders of India, we come to the outlying tribes of the great Mongolian family, which on this side have effected a lodgment on the hills within the Indian frontier, without being able to penetrate into the heart of the country or to descend into the sweltering plains of the Ganges. Thus, among the Maghs of the Hill Tracts of Chittagong, whose physical features stamp them unmistakeably as Mongolians, the ordinary Hindoo rules as to prohibited degrees are observed, with the exception that "a man may marry the daughters of his father's sister and of his mother's brother—a connexion which would not ordinarily be allowed."[3] Among the Mikirs, one of the most numerous and homogeneous of the many Tibeto-Burman tribes inhabiting Assam, a man is free to marry his mother's brother's daughter; indeed, in former days he was compelled to marry her, and his maternal uncle might beat him to his heart's content if the young scapegrace was ungallant enough to refuse the hand of his fair first cousin.[4] Again, among the Garos of Assam, another tribe of Mongolian origin[5] "there is an exception to the rule that a girl may choose her husband. This exception occurs when one daughter of a family is given in marriage to the son of her father's sister. Should she not have such a cousin, she must marry a man of her father's 'motherhood,' who is chosen for a substitute."[6] In

[1] (Sir) H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, i. 425.

[2] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 256.

[3] (Sir) H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, ii. 29 *sq.*

[4] *The Mikirs*, from the papers of the late Edward Stack, edited, arranged, and supplemented by Sir Charles Lyall (London, 1908), pp. 1, 17, 18.

[5] See above, vol. i. p. 462.

[6] Major A. Playfair, *The Garos* (London, 1909), p. 68.

this tribe a man is expected to marry his mother's brother's daughter.[1] Here again, therefore, as among the Mikirs, a decided preference seems to be given to the marriage of a woman with the son of her father's sister, or, in other words, to the marriage of a man with the daughter of his mother's brother. Again, among the Nagas of Assam, "marriage is contracted with near relatives, such as cousins, in preference to other women," and among his cousins a young man generally chooses as his wife the daughter of his mother's brother.[2]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Khasis and other tribes of North-Eastern India.

Among the Khasis of Assam a man may marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister, but on one curious condition, which we have not yet met with in our investigation of cousin marriages. A man may not marry his mother's brother's daughter while her father is alive; he may not marry his father's sister's daughter while his own father is alive. However, even when a man's father is dead, the marriage with the father's sister's daughter, though permitted, is looked on with disfavour by the Khasis; whereas there seems to be no objection to marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, always provided that her father is dead.[3] Here, again, therefore, as in so many cases, it would appear that marriage with a mother's brother's daughter is preferred to marriage with a father's sister's daughter. But while among the Khasis a man may marry either of his cross-cousins, that is, either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister, he is forbidden to marry his ortho-cousin, the daughter of his father's brother, for she is called his "birth sister" (*para kha*).[4] We may conjecture that for a similar reason he is forbidden to marry his other ortho-cousin, the daughter of his mother's sister. Among the Paihtes or Vuites, a clan in south-western Manipur and the adjoining portions of the Lushai Hills, "the marriages of paternal first cousins are allowed; in fact, among chiefs they are the rule."[5] The expression "paternal cousins" is ambiguous,

[1] Major A. Playfair, *op. cit.* p. 72.

[2] *A Sketch of Assam, with some account of the Hill Tribes*, by an Officer [John Butler] (London, 1847), pp. 165, 167.

[3] Lieut.-Colonel P. R. T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, Second Edition (London, 1914), p. 78.

[4] P. R. T. Gurdon, *l.c.*

[5] Lt.-Colonel J. Shakespeare, *The Lushei Kuki Clans* (London, 1912), p. 143.

since it includes the children of two brothers as well as the children of a brother and a sister, in other words, it includes both ortho-cousins and cross-cousins; but the statement probably means that among the Paihtes a man is allowed or encouraged to marry the daughter of his father's sister. "The Tibetans and Lepchas forbid cousins-german to marry, but the Bhotias confine the prohibition to cousins on the father's side, and more particularly to the children of the father's brother. The reason given is that bone descends from the father's side, and the flesh from the mother's, and should cousins on the father's side marry, the bone is pierced, resulting in course of time in various infirmities."[1] Here the expression "cousins on the father's side," like the equivalent expression "paternal cousins," is ambiguous, since it includes the children of two brothers as well as the children of a brother and a sister, in other words, it includes both ortho-cousins and cross-cousins. But from the statement which I have quoted we may probably infer that, while the Bhotias positively forbid a man to marry the daughter of his father's brother, and also forbid him, though less decidedly, to marry the daughter of his father's sister, they allow him freely to marry the daughter of his mother's brother. Here again, therefore, as in many other tribes, marriage with a mother's brother's daughter is the solitary exception to the rule which forbids cousins to marry each other.

Cross-cousin marriage generally favoured in India.

To sum up, we may say broadly that in India marriage with a first cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, but especially with the daughter of a mother's brother, has been, as a rule, permitted and even favoured among all races except the Aryan.

§ 4. *The Marriage of Cousins in other Parts of Asia*

Cousin marriage in other parts of Asia.

The custom of cousin marriage is also practised by tribes in other parts of Asia, though details concerning the custom are generally wanting, the writers who record it being for the most part apparently unaware of the important dis-

[1] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), pp. 252 *sq.*

tinctions which many peoples draw between those different classes of relations whom Europeans confound under the general name of cousins.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Chins of Burma.

Among the Burmese the marriage of cousins of all kinds is very common.[1] The Chins, a hill tribe of the Tibeto-Burman stock, who are scattered widely over the wild mountains of Arakan and the adjoining districts of Burma, habitually marry their cousins and tell a legend to account for the origin of the custom. They say that in the beginning the earth produced a woman called Hlee-neu, who laid a hundred eggs, from which sprang the various races of men. One egg, which failed to hatch with the rest, she threw away; but a bird found it and sat on it and hatched it, and from the egg were born a boy and a girl. These two were separated before they grew up; and the boy, having no mate, took a bitch to wife. After a time, however, he met the girl and wished to marry her; but as they were brother and sister, they went and consulted their great mother Hlee-neu, who is believed to be the author of all Chin laws and customs. "She ordered that the bitch which the man had married should be killed, and then they should marry, and that among their descendants in all time brothers' sons should intermarry with brothers' daughters. This they give as the origin of two of their peculiar customs—the sacrificing of dogs to the spirits (and eating them afterwards), and the right a man has to claim his cousin on the father's side as a wife."[2] The expression "his cousin on the father's side," is ambiguous, since it includes the father's sister's daughter as well as the father's brother's daughter; but from the preceding sentence, "in all time brothers' sons should intermarry with brothers' daughters," we naturally infer that the cousin whom a Chin man has the right to claim in marriage is the daughter of his father's brother. But as that woman is his ortho-cousin, it is contrary to general usage that he should be allowed to marry her. Accordingly we may conjecture that the cousin whom a Chin man has a right to marry is the daughter, not of his father's brother but of his father's sister; and this

[1] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 252.

[2] Captain C. J. F. S. Forbes, *British Burma* (London, 1878), p. 254.

conjecture is rendered highly probable by another statement of the same writer on the next page, that "another fixed rule is that the eldest son must marry the youngest daughter of his father's eldest sister."[1] Hence we may suppose that the sentence, "in all time brothers' sons should intermarry with brothers' daughters" is a mistake for, "in all time brothers' sons should intermarry with sisters' daughters"; and consequently that the Chins conform to the usual practice of allowing, or rather enjoining, the marriage of cross-cousins and forbidding the marriage of ortho-cousins. Thus interpreted, the Chin custom of cousin marriage agrees better with the story told to account for its origin, since according to that not wholly convincing narrative mankind are descended from the offspring of a brother and a sister, not from the offspring of two brothers.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Singphos or Kachins of Upper Burma.

Among the Singphos or Kachins of Upper Burma "it seems to be a general rule that a man should marry a first cousin on the female side, or more precisely the daughter of a mother's brother. He may not, however, marry his father's sister's child, who is regarded as closely related. Blood connection is generally traced through the female, which may or may not be a reminiscence of polyandry. This rule seems much relaxed among the Southern Kachins, but it is said that farther north, if there is a marriageable first cousin whom a man does not want to marry, he can marry elsewhere only after paying a fine to the injured parents of the damsel. The parents are injured because they are robbed of a certainty in the price of the girl. The forbidden degrees of consanguinity are—(1) Parents and grand-parents; (2) children and grand-children; (3) father's sister's child; (4) father's brother's child (because of the same name); (5) mother's sister's child."[2] According to this account all marriages of cousins are barred among the Singphos or Kachins, with the single exception of marriage with a mother's brother's daughter, which is so far from being prohibited that, at least among the Northern Kachins, a

[1] C. J. F. S. Forbes, *British Burma*, p. 255.

[2] (Sir) J. George Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States* (Rangoon, 1900–1901), Part i. vol. i. p. 404.

man who refuses to marry that particular cousin must pay a fine to her parents. On the other hand Sir Edward Gait tells us that "in Burma the Khyengs and Kachins regard a woman's daughters as the most suitable brides for her brothers' sons";[1] in other words, a man's proper wife is the daughter of his father's sister, which contradicts Sir George Scott's statement that a man is forbidden to marry his father's sister's daughter. In this conflict of authorities Sir George Scott seems to be supported by the testimony of Major C. R. Macgregor, who, writing from personal observation, says, "The marriage customs of the Singphos are simple. A youth should marry his cousin, his mother's niece if possible. Should a cousin not be available, the maternal uncle should arrange for a girl of his class. Should he be unable to procure one, the uncle goes to another family and says, 'If you give me a girl for my nephew, I will pay you back in kind when one of your family requires a bride.' The father of the youth then gives a feast and presents to the girl's family. Should the bridegroom's father not be in a position to give presents, he gives or sells one of his daughters to the other family in lieu of presents."[2] In this account the expression "his mother's niece" is ambiguous, as it might mean either his mother's brother's daughter or his mother's sister's daughter; but the reference to the maternal uncle makes it practically certain that according to Major Macgregor the cousin whom a Kachin ought to marry is the daughter of his mother's brother and not the daughter of his father's sister. As Sir George Scott had the best opportunities for informing himself as to the usages of the Kachins, we may perhaps accept this confirmation of his evidence as conclusive; unless indeed we prefer to suppose, as is quite possible, that the custom varies in different parts of the tribe, some of the Kachins recommending marriage with the mother's brother's daughter, and others preferring marriage with the father's sister's daughter. In any case, our authorities agree that among the Kachins cross-cousin

[1] *Census of India, 1911*, vol i. *India*, Part i., *Report* by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 256.

[2] Major C. R. Macgregor, "Journey of the Expedition under Colonel Woodthorpe, R.E., from Upper Assam to the Irawadi and return over the Patkoi Range," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, N.S. ix. (1887) p. 23.

marriage, in one form or another, is the favourite sort of matrimonial union.

Cousin marriage among the Karens of Burma.

With regard to the Zayeins or Sawng-tung Karens, of Upper Burma, we are told that "the marriage customs of the race are very singular, and are so strictly adhered to that it seems certain that the race must in process of time become extinct. There are many grey-haired bachelors in the *haws*, and many aged spinsters in the villages, whom Sawng-tung custom has prevented from marrying. Marriages are only permitted between near relations, such as cousins, and then only when the union is approved by the elders. . . . This limitation of marriage to near relations only, results frequently in unions where husband and wife are very unequal in age—the husband fifteen and the wife seventy, or the reverse."[1] Among the Bghais, a tribe of Karens in Burma, marriages "ought to be always contracted among relatives. First cousins marry, but that relation is considered undesirably near. Second cousins are deemed most suitable for marriage. Third cousins may marry without impropriety, though that relation is considered as undesirably remote. Beyond third cousins marriages are prohibited."[2] Among the Miaos, an aboriginal race of Southern China, it is said that girls are compelled to marry their first cousins, the sons of their mother's brothers;[3] in other words, a man has a right to marry the daughter of his father's sister. Among the Sabimba, an aboriginal tribe of the Orang Laut stock in the Malay Peninsula, first cousins who were the children of two brothers might not marry each other; but, on the other hand, marriage was allowed between first cousins who were the children either of two sisters or of a brother and a sister.[4]

Cousin marriage in Southern China and the Malay Peninsula.

Among the Gilyaks, who inhabit the lower valley of the

[1] (Sir) J. George Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, Part i. vol. i. p. 540, compare p. 547.

[2] F. Mason, D.D., "Physical Character of the Karens," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, New Series, No. cxxxi. (1866) pp. 18 *sq.*

[3] J. Kohler, "Kleinere Skizzen aus der ethnolog. Jurisprudenz," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, vi. (Stuttgart, 1886) p. 406, referring to Neumann, *Asiatische Studien*, i. 74, whose information is drawn from a Chinese work.

[4] J. R. Logan, "The Orang Sabimba," *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, i. (Singapore, 1847), p. 297; W. W. Skeat and Ch. O. Blagden, *Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula* (London, 1906), ii. 84.

Amoor and the northern part of the island of Saghalien, the most proper marriage which a man can contract is with his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother; and such marriages are still the commonest in the tribe. A man applies to all such cousins the name of wife, and he has the right to marry any of them. If any of them is given in marriage to another man, her first cousin, the son of her father's sister, still retains his marital rights over her. On the other hand a man is forbidden to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his father's sister.[1] Thus our information concerning the Gilyaks is precise; they strongly favour marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother, and positively forbid marriage with the daughter of a father's sister.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Gilyaks.

But when we pass to the other tribes of North-Eastern Siberia, we have to put up with vague statements as to the marriage of cousins in general, without any indication of the particular sort of cousins to which the statements apply. The Ainos of Japan "marry their cousins very often, and in some cases their nieces even."[2] Among the Kamchadales we are told by a writer of the eighteenth century that "the nearest cousins commonly marry each other."[3] The Chukchee, who inhabit the north-eastern extremity of Siberia, "have several methods of securing brides and concluding marriages. One of these is through marriage between relatives, if possible in the same family, or at least in the same camp, or in the neighboring camp, where families of the same blood reside. Most frequent are marriages between cousins. Marriage between uncle and niece is considered incestuous."[4] On the other hand, marriage with cousins is reported to be forbidden at the present day among the Koryaks, the neighbours of the Chukchee;[5] though a writer of the eighteenth century tells us that the Koryaks

Cousin marriage among the tribes of North-Eastern Siberia,

[1] Miss M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia* (Oxford, 1914), p. 99; Leo Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Nations of North-East Asia," *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Congress of Americanists*, p. 324. Miss Czaplicka's authority appears to be L. Sternberg, *The Gilyak* (1905), a work which I have not seen.

[2] J. Batchelor, *The Ainu and their Folk-lore* (London, 1901), p. 228.

[3] Stephan Krascheninnikow, *Beschreibung des Landes Kamtschatka* (Lemgo, 1766), p. 259.

[4] Waldemar Bogoras, *The Chukchee* (Leyden and New York, 1904–1909), p. 576 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii.).

[5] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (Leyden and New York, 1908), p. 736 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vi.).

generally married relations, and that a man might take to wife any woman except his mother and his sister.[1] Among the Yukaghirs of Siberia marriages between first cousins were prohibited, but marriages between second cousins were allowed, and they seem to be still occasionally contracted, though such unions are forbidden by the statutes of the Greek Church, to which the miserable remnant of the tribe professes its conversion.[2] Among the Ostiaks it is said to be lawful for a man to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his father's sister, provided that his wife's mother (his father's sister) has been married into a tribe or family different from her own. In that case, her brother is also allowed to marry her daughter, his niece.[3]

It is to be hoped that future researches among the Asiatic tribes outside of India may elicit fuller and more exact information on the subject of cousin marriage, which is of great importance for the history of marriage in general.

§ 5. *The Marriage of Cousins in America*

Cousin marriage probably once common, though little recorded, among the aborigines of America.

Among the aborigines of America the custom of cousin marriage appears to be very seldom recorded; but from the silence of the record it would be rash to infer the absence of the institution, since the custom may be widespread without attracting the attention of observers unfamiliar with primitive systems of kinship, and in particular with the fundamental distinction which many of these systems draw between different classes of cousins in respect of marriageability. However, a few indications allow us to conjecture that the custom, though almost unrecorded, was once common among the aboriginal races, both Indian and Eskimo, of America, and that inquiries conducted at an earlier time, when the tribes were as yet but little influenced by an alien civilization, might have brought ample evidence of it to light.

[1] S. Krascheninnikow, *Beschreibung des Landes Kamtschatka*, p. 280.

[2] W. Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus* (Leyden and New York, 1910), pp. 79 *sq.*, 82, 84 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. ix. Part i.).

[3] P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs* (St. Petersburg, 1771–1776), iii. 51. Compare Miss M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia*, p. 126.

Cousin marriage among the Aleuts.

The Atkha Aleuts, who inhabit the Andreianof, Rat, and Bering islands, between Alaska and Kamtchatka, "allowed intermarriage between all relatives, with the exception of a brother to a sister, father with his daughter, and a son with his mother; and in the case of the death of one brother, the other was obliged to marry the widow."[1] This information was communicated by Father Yakoff to Father Innocentius Veniaminoff, our principal authority on the old customs of the Aleutian Islanders, as these were observed in the days before intercourse with Europeans had profoundly modified the natives. Of Father Veniaminoff, afterwards Bishop of Kamtchatka, we are told that "he alone of the Greek missionaries to Alaska has left behind him an undying record of devotion, self-sacrifice, and love, both to God and man, combined with the true missionary fire. To him also we owe the first detailed account of the modern Aleutian character and mode of life."[2] Now, Father Veniaminoff "mentions that among the Aleut the daughter of one's uncle was most frequently elected for one's bride."[3] Here the expression uncle is, as usual, ambiguous, since it covers both the father's brother and the mother's brother; but judging by the analogy of cousin marriage in India and elsewhere, we may conclude, with a fair degree of probability, that the marriage which the Aleutians preferred to all others was marriage with a first cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother.

Cousin marriage among the Eskimo affirmed by some writers.

The statements of our authorities as to the marriage of cousins among the Eskimo are contradictory. With regard to the Eskimo about Bering Strait, one of our best authorities, Mr. E. W. Nelson, tells us that they "frequently marry first cousins or remote blood relatives with the idea that in such a case a wife is nearer to her husband. One man said that in case of famine, if a man's wife was from another family she would steal food from him to save her own life, while the husband would die of starvation; but should a

[1] Ivan Petroff, *Report on the Population, Industries and Resources of Alaska*, p. 158.

[2] William H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources* (London, 1870), p. 385.

[3] *Notes on the Islands of Unalashka District*, Part iii. p. 76, quoted by W. Bogoras, *The Chukchee* (Leyden and New York, 1904–1909), p. 576 note [1] (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii.).

woman be of his own blood, she would share fairly with him. The wife is considered to become more a part of the husband's family than he of hers. However, brothers and sisters, and step-brothers and step-sisters, do not intermarry."[1] Again, of the Eskimo who live between Igloolik on the north and Noowook on the south we are told by Captain G. F. Lyon, who resided among them, that "cousins are allowed to marry, but a man will not wed two sisters."[2]

Cousin marriage among the Eskimo denied by other writers.

On the other hand, the Danish writer H. Rink, a high authority on the Eskimo, says that "the Eskimo disapprove of marriages between cousins,"[3] and speaking of the Central Eskimo, the eminent American ethnologist Dr. Franz Boas affirms that "marriages between relatives are forbidden: cousins, nephew and niece, aunt and uncle are not allowed to intermarry. There is, however, no law to prevent a man from marrying two sisters. It is remarkable that Lyon states just the reverse. I am sure, however, that my statements are correct in reference to the Davis Straits tribes."[4] Again, Hans Egede, who was a missionary for twenty-five years among the Eskimo of Greenland, affirms that "they refrain from marrying their next relations, even in the third degree, taking such matches to be unwarrantable and quite unnatural."[5] However, another high authority on the Greenlanders is by no means so categorical in his denial of the marriage of near relatives among them. He says, "They seldom marry first cousins, or even persons that are no relations, if they have been bred up together in one house as adopted children."[6]

Perhaps the Eskimo forbid the marriage of ortho-cousins and allow the marriage of cross-cousins.

Perhaps we may reconcile these apparent discrepancies by supposing that, while the Eskimo strictly forbid marriage between first cousins, the children either of two brothers or of two sisters, they permit the marriage of first cousins the

[1] E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Bering Strait," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, Part i. (Washington, 1899) p. 291.

[2] Captain G. F. Lyon, *Private Journal during the recent Voyage of Discovery under Captain Parry* (London, 1824), p. 353.

[3] H. Rink, *The Eskimo Tribes, their Distribution and Characteristics* (Copenhagen, 1887), p. 23.

[4] Franz Boas, "The Central Eskimo," *Sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, 1888), p. 579.

[5] Hans Egede, *A Description of Greenland* (London, 1818), p. 143.

[6] David Crantz, *History of Greenland* (London, 1767), i. 159.

children of a brother and of a sister respectively; and that the writers who deny the practice of cousin marriage among the Eskimo have been misled by attending only to the instances of it which are forbidden and overlooking the instances of it which are permitted. The extremely hard conditions of life in the Arctic regions necessitate the dispersion of a scanty population over a wide extent of territory; hence the local groups are inevitably small, and it is difficult to imagine how they could continue to exist without a considerable degree of comparatively close inbreeding.[1] Under these circumstances, and with this important limitation, the witnesses who affirm the practice of cousin marriages among the Eskimo seem entitled to more credence than those who deny it.[2]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Western Tinnehs.

Among the Western Tinnehs, a branch of the great Tinneh stock, which occupies a large part of North-Western America, the marriage of certain first cousins was common and in some cases almost obligatory; and the particular form of cousin marriage which was allowed or even enforced appears to have been the one with the daughter of the mother's brother. This may be inferred from the following account of the marriage customs of the Western Tinnehs, written by an experienced Catholic missionary who lived in the tribe for many years and made an accurate study of its customs. His account deserves to be read with attention, because it shows how a strong aversion to consanguineous marriages in general may coexist in the same tribe with an exceptional permission of, and even preference for, a particular form of cousin marriage; and from this again we may gather how easy it would be, even for an intelligent

[1] Compare V. Stefánsson, *My Life with the Eskimo* (London, 1913), p. 401, "As Eskimo communities are small and the people are necessarily usually related in one way or another, it is common to find a child addressed as a relative by every person in the village. It is one of the child's earliest tasks to learn to recognize all these people and to address them by the proper terms of relationship, dealing with them in this matter entirely with reference to their relation to his guardian spirit." However, it is to be observed that, according to the writer, these terms of relationship refer to spiritual, not physical, affinity.

[2] I am thus compelled to differ from my friend M. Marcel Mauss, who in his study of Eskimo society accepts the denials, and rejects the affirmations, of cousin marriage among the Eskimo. See M. Mauss, "Essai sur les Variations Saisonnières des Sociétés Eskimos, Étude de Morphologie Sociale," *L'Année Sociologique*, Neuvième Année (1904–1905) (Paris, 1906), pp. 107 *sqq.*

inquirer, to observe the general rule without noting the exception, and hence to affirm, quite erroneously, that all marriages of cousins in a certain tribe are prohibited.

Father A. G. Morice on the aversion of the Western Tinnehs to consanguineous marriages.

After explaining that the Western Tinnehs or, as he calls them, Dénés, are divided into a number of totemic clans, Father A. G. Morice proceeds as follows: "Now from time immemorial, a fundamental law in their social constitution has been for individuals of the same clan never to intermarry. So it is that endogamy is looked upon with horror among them. Indeed, I think I am warranted in affirming that marriage with a consanguine, unless a very close one, was preferred to matrimonial union with a co-clansman. As it is, agnation and consanguinity in the direct or collateral line on the paternal side were considered powerful barriers to sexual relations, males and females descended from the same stock being always regarded as brothers and sisters. But at what particular point the offspring of a common or collateral (on the father's side) branch would be deemed sufficiently distant to admit of matrimonial union is more than I can say, none among the natives themselves being able to satisfactorily solve that question. All I can say is that as long as the common ancestors of two individuals were remembered, the latter were easily dissuaded from contracting marriage together, even to the fourth and perhaps the fifth degree of consanguinity, especially if in the direct line. I do not mean to say that there never were tacitly allowed deviations from this law, nor absolutely any intermarriage in the same clan. But the repugnance which such unions inspired only goes to show that in this case, as in others, the exception confirms or proves the rule.

Marriage with a mother's brother's daughter favoured by the Western Tinnehs.

"Such was not the case, however, with consanguinity in collateral lines by the mother's side, cousins of that class, even as near as the first degree, being by a time-honored custom almost bound to intermarry. And here it is as well to state at once that, in common with nearly all primitive people, mother-right is the supreme law regulating succession among the Western Dénés, and I may add that here (at Stuart's Lake) it admits of no exception whatever. On the other hand, another ordinance of their social code forbids titles as well as landed property to pass by heredity into a

different clan. Therefore children of a notable among them belonging to their mother's clan, could never inherit from their father. But if the latter had nephews by a sister, one of them was *de jure* his successor, this nephew belonging through his mother to his uncle's clan. Now, by way of compensation, and to permit the notable's children, who could not otherwise inherit from him, to enjoy at least as much as was lawful of their father's succession, one of his daughters would be united in marriage with her inheriting maternal first cousin."[1]

Economic motive which induces the Tinnehs to favour marriage with a mother's brother's daughter.

From this account we learn that under the rule of mother-kin, which the Tinnehs or Dénés observe, a man's heir is not his own son but his sister's son, and hence that in order to give his own children some share of his property after his death, a man seeks to marry his daughter to his sister's son, who is his heir. Thus through marriage with her first cousin, the son of her father's sister, a woman enjoys to some extent the paternal estate which descends from her father to her husband. On these grounds every Tinneh Indian who has property to bequeath and desires that his children should benefit by it, has a direct interest in promoting the marriage of his daughter with her first cousin, the son of her father's sister. So far, therefore, the proper marriage for a Tinneh woman is with the son of her father's sister; and the proper marriage for a Tinneh man is with the daughter of his mother's brother. It is, therefore, apparently to these cousins that Father Morice refers when he says that they are, "by a time-honored custom, almost bound to intermarry," and it is this form of cousin marriage that Father Morice has in mind when in another passage he writes that "marriage between even first cousins, if on the mother's side, was quite common, and, in some cases, almost obligatory."[2]

[1] Rev. Father A. G. Morice, O.M.I., Stuart's Lake, B.C., "The Western Dénés, their Manners and Customs," *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Toronto*, Third Series, vol. vii. Fasciculus No. 1 (October 1889), pp. 118 *sq.*

[2] Father A. G. Morice, "Are the Carrier Sociology and Mythology indigenous or exotic?" *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the year 1892*, x. (Ottawa, 1893), Transactions, Section ii. p. 112. In the light of the foregoing passages we must interpret another of Father Morice's statements concerning cousin marriages which at first sight seems to contradict the statement last quoted. He says, "First cousins married each other without any scruple if related only through the father's side" ("The Canadian Dénés," *Annual*

The same marriage is favoured for like reasons by some Dravidian tribes of India.

It is interesting and instructive to observe Indians of Western Canada desiring and promoting the marriage of a man with his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, for the same economic reasons which have apparently led some Dravidian tribes of Central India to favour, though probably not to originate, the very same kind of marriage between cousins.[1] To suppose that in preferring such a marriage the red Indian has copied from the black Dravidian, or the black Dravidian from the red Indian, would be absurd; both act independently in obedience to similar economic motives operating similarly on men in distant countries who live under similar social institutions. To say this, however, is not to prejudge the question whether these social institutions themselves have or have not a common origin.

Cross-cousin marriage probably is or was commoner among the American Indians than appears from the record.

So far as I am aware, this is the only clear case of preference for marriage with a first cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother, which has been recorded in the whole of North America.[2] But the case is so typical and it fits in so

---

Archaeological Report, 1905, Toronto, 1906, p. 201). Here Father Morice seems to have been thinking of the marriage from the side of the woman, who marries her *paternal* aunt's son. But the expressions "cousin on the father's side" and "cousin on the mother's side" are both ambiguous and apt to lead to confusion. In exact discussions of marriage customs they should, therefore, be strictly avoided. Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 349 *sq.* Mr. C. Hill-Tout understands Father Morice's meaning as I do (*British North America, the Far West, the Home of the Salish and Déné*, London, 1907, pp. 145 *sq.*).

[1] See above, pp. 123 *sq.*

[2] Speaking of the marriage of cross-cousins in America, Dr. W. H. R. Rivers observes, "So far as I am aware, the only people among whom it has been recorded are the Haidahs of Queen Charlotte Island" (*Kinship and Social Organisation*, London, 1914, pp. 54 *sq.*). He seems to have overlooked the case of the Western Tinnehs, to which I had called attention in *Totemism and Exogamy* (London, 1910), iii. 348 *sq.* For the marriage of cross-cousins among the Haidas he refers to J. R. Swanton, *Contributions to the Ethnology of the Haida* (Leyden and New York, 1905), p. 62 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. v.). But in that passage Mr. Swanton clearly uses the terms "fathers' sisters' daughters" and "mothers' brothers' daughters" in the classificatory sense, so that there is no necessary implication of marriage between cousins in our sense of the term. Dr. Rivers adds, "Miss Freire-Marreco tells me that the cross-cousin marriage occurs among some of the Hopi Indians." Though he does not say whether the marriage is with a mother's brother's daughter or with a father's sister's daughter, the statement is very important, since it proves the occurrence of the cross-cousin marriage among the Southern Indians. Finding such marriages in the far South and the far North of North America, we may confidently conjecture that it was once widespread in the intermediate area.

well, as we shall see presently, with the classificatory system of relationship which appears to be universally observed by the American Indians, that it is hardly rash to conjecture that such marriages are or were formerly very much commoner among the Indian tribes of America than appears from such a meagre record, and that they have only escaped observation because inquirers have not attended to the fundamental distinction between the classes of marriageable and not-marriageable cousins. Hence we may legitimately receive with distrust the statements even of otherwise competent observers as to the general prohibition of marriage between cousins in certain tribes. Thus, for example, with regard to the Thompson Indians of British Columbia, Mr. James Teit, to whom we are indebted for a very valuable account of their customs, observes, "Cousins were forbidden to marry, because they were of one blood, similar to sister and brother; and the union of distant blood relations was discountenanced. Even if second-cousins married, they were laughed at and talked about."[1] Similarly we are told that the Cherokees "do not marry their first or second cousins."[2] We may accept these statements as to first cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, who are commonly regarded as brothers and sisters even by people who permit and encourage the marriage of other first cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively: on the other hand, we may doubt the statements in their application to cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively.

All general statements as to the absence of cousin marriage among the American Indians must be received with caution.

Again, with regard to the Shuswaps, another Indian tribe of British Columbia, Mr. Teit tells us that "blood-relations did not marry, not even second-cousins."[3] Yet another high authority, Dr. Franz Boas, speaking of the same tribe, affirms that "marriages between cousins were not forbidden."[4] On the hypothesis here suggested both these

[1] James Teit, *The Thompson Indians of British Columbia* (New York, 1900), p. 325 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*).

[2] James Adair, *History of the American Indians* (London, 1775), p. 190.

[3] James Teit, *The Shuswap* (Leyden and New York, 1909), p. 591 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. ii. Part vii.).

[4] Franz Boas, in "Sixth Report of the Committee on the North-Western Tribes of Canada," p. 91 (separate reprint from *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Leeds Meeting, 1890*).

eminent anthropologists were right and both were wrong; for the affirmation and the denial of cousin marriage were both alike true as to one class of cousins and false as to another. Both would have escaped the error into which, on my supposition, they fell, if only they had attended to the fundamental distinction between cousins who are marriageable and cousins who are not. If that is so, it follows that all general statements as to the absolute prohibition of cousin marriages among the Indians of America [1] are to be received with doubt, if not with scepticism. How well founded is that doubt or that scepticism, will appear more clearly when we have considered the classificatory system of relationship, on which the whole marriage system of the American Indians is built up.

There is some ground for thinking that the marriage of

[1] See, for example, W. M. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources* (London, 1870), p. 196, "Cousins do not marry among the Ingaliks"; G. M. Sproat, *Scenes and Studies of Savage Life* (London, 1868), p. 99, "By the old custom of the Aht tribes, no marriage was permitted within the degree of second-cousin"; L. Farrand, in "Twelfth Report of the Committee on the North-Western Tribes of Canada," *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Bristol Meeting, 1898*, p. 645, among the Chilcotin Indians of British Columbia "recognised blood relationship was and is always an absolute bar to marriage, and at present this recognition seems to extend no further than first cousins"; A. F. Chamberlain, in "Eighth Report of the Committee on the North-Western Tribes of Canada," *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Edinburgh Meeting, 1892*, p. 13 (of the separate reprint), among the Kootenay Indians of British Columbia "intermarriage of first cousins appears not to have been allowed"; H. R. Schoolcraft, *The Indian Tribes of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1853–1856), v. 655, the Indians of Oregon "never will (or but rarely) marry a cousin; thus that mode of degeneration is avoided"; W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River* (London, 1825), ii. 167, among the Chippewas, "cousins german are considered in the same light as brothers and held to be bound by the same rules; relationship is not felt beyond this degree"; Stephen Powers, *Tribes of California* (Washington, 1877), p. 192, with regard to the Gualalas of California, "in marriage they observe strictly the Mosaic table of prohibited affinities, accounting it 'poison,' as they say, for a person to marry a cousin, or an avuncular relative"; W. M. Gabb, "On the Indian Tribes and Languages of Costa Rica," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia*, xiv. (Philadelphia, 1876), pp. 496 *sq.*, "Cousins, even to a remote degree, are called brother and sister, and are most strictly prohibited from intermarriage. The law, or custom, is not an introduced one, but one handed down from remote times. The penalty for its violation was originally very severe; nothing less than the burial alive of both parties"; E. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage* (London, 1891), p. 299, among the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, "no marriage, no intercourse ever takes place among blood-relations, even to second cousins" (on the authority of Mr. Bridges).

cross-cousins was in full vogue among the Caribs of the Antilles, for we read that "when our savages desire to marry they have the right to take all their female cousins-german; they have nothing to do but to say that they take them to wife, whereupon the women are naturally acquired by them, and they may carry them off to their houses without ceremony, and thenceforth the women are looked upon as their legitimate wives."[1] Another old writer tells us that among the Caribs a man's female cousins-german on the mother's side are his "born wives," and that the Caribs "are born married, so to say, in virtue of the rule laid down by their law and of the right which male cousins have over their female cousins-german."[2] Among the Arawaks of Guiana it is reported to be the rule that cousins "on the father's side" may marry each other, but that cousins "on the mother's side" may not. On the other hand among the Caribs cousins, both on the paternal and on the maternal side, are free to marry each other.[3] The expressions "on the father's side" and "on the mother's side" are ambiguous. Perhaps the writer who reports these rules meant to say that among the Arawaks a man may marry his first cousin the daughter of his father's sister, but not his first cousin the daughter of his mother's brother, and that among the Caribs marriage with both these cousins was permitted. Again, with regard to the Indians of the Isanna River, a tributary of the Rio Negro in North-Western Brazil, we are told that "they marry one, two, or three wives, and prefer relations, marrying with cousins, uncles with nieces, and nephews with aunts, so that in a village all are connected."[4]

Cousin marriage among the Indians of the Antilles and of South America.

§ 6. *The Marriage of Cousins in Africa*

Among the black races of Africa, including both the Bantus and the pure negroes, the marriage of a man with his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother

Cross-cousin marriage common in Africa.

[1] De Rochefort, *Histoire Naturelle et Morale des Iles Antilles* (Rotterdam, 1665), p. 544.

[2] J. F. Lafitau, *Mœurs des Sauvages Ameriquains* (Paris, 1724), i. 557, 560.

[3] C. van Coll, "Gegevens over Land en Volk van Suriname," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie*, lv. (1903) p. 503.

[4] A. R. Wallace, *Narrative of Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro* (London, 1889), p. 353.

or of his father's sister, is frequently permitted and sometimes preferred, while on the contrary the marriage of a man with his first cousin, the daughter either of his father's brother or of his mother's sister, is generally prohibited. In short, as a rule, the marriage of cross-cousins is allowed, and the marriage of ortho-cousins is disallowed. However, there are exceptions to the rule. In some tribes, as we shall see, all marriages of first cousins are absolutely prohibited.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Herero of South-West Africa.

Thus, to begin with the Bantu tribes of South Africa, among the Herero of South-West Africa "marriages between relations are so much preferred that marriages between persons who are not related to each other are actually a rarity. Again, among relations marriages between cousins are especially preferred, but only between children of a brother and a sister, not between the children of two brothers or of two sisters, because the Herero assert that children of such blood relations are weak and die. . . . Such a marriage is not only improper, but is actually regarded as a horror, because the children of two brothers or of two sisters are themselves brothers and sisters according to Herero law, and sexual intercourse between them is viewed as incest and even subjects the culprits to the consequences of the blood-feud." However, the custom which directs a man to marry his cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, is often broken through, but even then the wife is still sought among the kinsfolk of her husband.[1]

Cousin marriage among the Bantu tribes of South-East Africa.

Again, "the Bechuanas and the Caffres acknowledge and respect the same degrees of consanguinity as we do. They do not reckon relationship beyond the degree of second cousin. Marriages between brothers and sisters, uncles and nieces, nephews and aunts are disapproved of. Those between cousins frequently take place, but there are some tribes who condemn them as incestuous."[2] Speaking of the Bantu tribes of South-East Africa, Dr. G. McCall Theal

[1] E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero* (Berlin, 1906), pp. 33 *sq.*, 37. Compare H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Südwest-Afrika* (Oldenburg and Leipsic, preface dated 1891), p. 177; Bensen, quoted by Prof. J. Kohler, "Das Recht der Herero," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv. (1900) pp. 300 *sq.*

[2] Rev. E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (London, 1861), p. 191.

observes, "Every man of a coast tribe regarded himself as the protector of those females whom we would call his cousins, second cousins, third cousins, and so forth, on the father's side, while some had a similar feeling towards the same relatives on the mother's side as well, and classified them all as sisters. Immorality with one of them would have been considered incestuous, something horrible, something unutterably disgraceful. Of old it was punished by the death of the male, and even now a heavy fine is inflicted upon him, while the guilt of the female must be atoned by a sacrifice performed with due ceremony by the tribal priest, or it is believed a curse will rest upon her and her issue. . . . In contrast to this prohibition the native of the interior almost as a rule married the daughter of his father's brother, in order, as he said, to keep property from being lost to his family. This custom more than anything else created a disgust and contempt for them by the people of the coast, who term such intermarriages the union of dogs, and attribute to them the insanity and idiocy which in recent times has become prevalent among the inland tribes."[1] This preference for marriage with a first cousin, the daughter of the father's brother, is rare; however, we shall meet it again in Madagascar and among the Arabs. Among the Hlubis and others commonly called Fingos, in this part of Africa, a man is free to marry his mother's brother's daughter,[2] which we have seen reason to regard as the most popular form of cousin marriage, the one of which Jacob's marriage with Leah and Rachel is the type.

Among the Nyanja-speaking tribes of Central Angoniland, in North-Eastern Rhodesia, including the Achewa and

[1] G. McCall Theal, *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, vii. (1901) pp. 431, 432. In a note (p. 432) the writer adds, "Among the tribes within the Cape Colony at the present time the differences are as follows:—

"Xosas, Tembus, and Pondos: marry no relative by blood, however distant, on either father's or mother's side.

"Hlubis and others commonly called Fingos: may marry the daughter of mother's brother and other relatives on that side, but not on father's side.

"Basuto, Batlaro, Batlapin, and Barolong: very frequently marry cousins on father's side, and know of no restrictions beyond actual sisters."

As I have already remarked, the expressions "cousins on the father's side" and "cousins on the mother's side" are ambiguous and should be avoided.

[2] See G. McCall Theal, quoted in the preceding note.

Cousin marriage among the Nyanja-speaking tribes of North-Eastern Rhodesia. Permission to marry ortho-cousins, the daughters of a mother's sister or of a father's brother, when the intermarrying cousins have different totems.

Angoni tribes, it appears that a man is everywhere free to marry his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister. Further, he may, under certain conditions, marry his ortho-cousin, the daughter of his mother's sister; and he may, under certain other conditions, marry his ortho-cousin, the daughter of his father's brother. The permission and the prohibition of marriage between ortho-cousins, the children of two sisters or of two brothers, vary according as the descent of the totem is reckoned in the paternal or in the maternal line. In tribes, such as the Angonis, which reckon the descent of the totem in the paternal line, the children of two brothers can never marry each other, because they necessarily have, like their fathers, the same totem. But in these tribes the children of two sisters may marry each other, if the two sisters married men of different totems; for in that case the cousins would have, like their fathers, different totems. In tribes, such as the Achewas, which reckon the descent of the totem in the maternal line, the rule is just the converse. In such tribes the children of two sisters can never marry each other, because they necessarily have, like their mothers, the same totem. But in these tribes the children of two brothers may marry each other, if the two brothers married women of different totems; for in that case the cousins would have, like their mothers, different totems.[1] In totemic society it is a general rule that identity of totems is a bar to marriage. Accordingly among these tribes of British Central Africa the marriage of cousins is barred when it conflicts, but is permitted when it does not conflict, with that general rule. But the marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, never conflicts with that general rule, since the cross-cousins have always different totems, whether descent of the totem be reckoned in the paternal or in the

[1] R. Sutherland Rattray, *Some Folk-lore Stories and Songs in Chinyanja* (London, 1907), p. 202. Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 399 *sq.*; J. C. C. Coxhead, *The Native Tribes of North-Eastern Rhodesia* (London, 1914), pp. 19 note[1] ("Succession amongst the Angoni is in the male line, amongst the Achewa in the female line"), 29. As to the Tumbuka of this region we are told that "people of the same clan name were not supposed to marry, but cousins who were children of a brother and sister might." See D. Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People* (London, 1914), p. 153.

maternal line; hence in these tribes cross-cousin marriages are always lawful.[1]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Awemba of North-Eastern Rhodesia.

The principles which regulate the marriage of cousins, allowing some and prohibiting others, are similar among the Awemba, another Bantu tribe of North-Eastern Rhodesia. In that tribe, a man may marry his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, because her totem is always different from his; but he is forbidden to marry his ortho-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother, because she is regarded as his sister. This is the gist of the marriage regulations set forth by Messrs. Gouldsbury and Sheane in the following instructive passage:—

Messrs. Gouldsbury and Sheane on cross-cousin marriage among the Awemba. First principle: marriage with a woman of the same totem prohibited.

"Among the Awemba we find two main principles regulating the laws of marriage affinities. The first is that a man may not marry a woman of his mother's totem; for instance an 'Elephant' man may not marry an 'Elephant' girl. The Awemba, it is true, are known by both the totems of their father and mother; but, in marriage, the totem of the father is not considered, that of the mother being the determining factor. Thus, female cousins, who bear the totem of his mother, are taboo to the young suitor. Though the marriage of cousins is of common occurrence, yet we cannot assert that marriages are made within the totem. A man may, for instance, marry the daughter of his maternal uncle, or the children of his paternal aunt, because the totems of their respective mothers are alien to his own, which he derived from the distaff side. The Wemba elders say that even marriages of cousins were prohibited in the olden days, and deprecate the present universal system of cousin marriage. It is, undoubtedly, one of the main reasons which render the Wemba women less prolific than the wives of the Wiwa and other tribes where such close unions are prohibited.

"The second principle is that a man may not marry

[1] What is here said of the marriage rules of these totemic tribes of Central Africa would not apply to certain totemic tribes of Central Australia, in which the totems do not descend either in the paternal or in the maternal line, and in which, moreover, the marriage of all first cousins is barred by a curious social machinery, which appears to have been specially devised for the purpose. See below, pp. 237 *sq.*

Second principle: marriage with the daughter of a "potential" father or mother prohibited.

the daughter of his 'potential' mother or father. On his father's decease the uncle [father's brother] inherits, and, owing to the generic system of nomenclature, takes the title of 'father.' The daughters of this paternal uncle are, therefore, always taboo to the prospective suitor, who is called their 'brother.' In the same way, since his aunt on the mother's side, in the event of the latter's death, assumes the title of 'mother,' he cannot marry any of the children of his maternal aunt, who are called his 'sisters.'

Cousin marriage forbidden among the Winamwanga.

"We may here contrast the marriage laws of the neighbouring Winamwanga, where descent is reckoned on the father's side, and where the son can inherit in default of a brother. They absolutely prohibit marriage with first cousins on either the father's or the mother's side. Yet the son takes over his father's wives as a matter of course. . . . To give a concrete instance: a man Kafyume, a polygamist, has a male child Kachinga. On his father's death, Kachinga will inherit and live with his father's wives, with the natural exception of his own mother, who is pensioned off. The Awemba express their disgust at a man marrying his father's wives, while the Winamwanga retaliate by asserting that the Awemba are so shameless in wedding their cousins that they would, no doubt, like to espouse their own sisters!"[1]

The father's brother is ranked as father, and the mother's sister is ranked as mother; hence marriage with the daughter of the father's brother or of the mother's sister is forbidden.

In this account the reasons assigned for barring the marriage of ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, deserve to be noted. It is not that the two cousins have the same totem, as, with maternal descent of the totem, would necessarily happen if they were children of two sisters, and as would happen also, with the same descent of the totem, if they were children of two brothers, provided that the brothers had married women of the same totem, for in that case their children would also have the same totem and therefore could not marry each other. Yet though the usual rule of totemic exogamy supplies a sufficient rule for prohibiting in this tribe all marriages between the children of sisters, and some marriages between the children of brothers, it is

[1] Cullen Gouldsbury and Hubert Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia* (London, 1911), pp. 172 *sq.*

not adduced as a reason for banning these unions. The reason alleged is quite different: it is that in the case of the children of two brothers, both the brothers are called "father" by the children, who therefore are related to each other as brothers and sisters and cannot intermarry; and that in the case of the children of two sisters, both the sisters are called "mother" by the children, who therefore are related to each other as brothers and sisters and cannot intermarry. Later on we shall see that this nomenclature for a father's brother and a mother's sister is characteristic of the classificatory or group system of relationship, with which the whole practice of cousin marriage is intimately bound up.

Cousin marriage absolutely forbidden in some tribes of North-Eastern Rhodesia.

From the account which Messrs. Gouldsbury and Sheane give we learn that among the Winamwanga all marriages of first cousins are absolutely prohibited. Their testimony is confirmed in less explicit terms by other witnesses. Thus Dr. J. A. Chisholm tells us that in this tribe "a man cannot marry into his own family, however distant the relationship. Marriage with a cousin would be looked on as marriage with a sister,"[1] and Mr. J. C. C. Coxhead reports that "a man is prohibited from marrying any female of his own family of the same totem, and cousin marriages (allowed amongst the Wemba) are strictly forbidden. Within the totem no sexual intercourse is allowed. If a brother and sister, or two cousins descended from males of the same totem, had intercourse, they were burnt to death in the olden time."[2] A prohibition, more or less complete, of cousin marriage is reported of other Bantu tribes in North-Eastern Rhodesia. Thus among the Awisa, who are divided into totemic clans with descent of the totem in the maternal line, "this is the main rule of relationship and marriage, and it is strictly observed. It is also considered wrong for near relations on the male side (half-brother and half-sister, or even cousins) to marry."[3] Again, among the

[1] Dr. James A. Chisholm, "Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Winamwanga and Wiwa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. 36 (July 1910), p. 383.

[2] J. C. C. Coxhead, *The Native Tribes of North-Eastern Rhodesia* (London, 1914), p. 51 (*Royal Anthropological Institute, Occasional Papers*, No. 5).

[3] J. C. C. Coxhead, *op. cit.* p. 34.

Alungu, "the prohibition from marriage with blood relations is stronger than that which exists amongst the Awemba, cousins not being allowed to marry until the fourth generation. The totem prohibition was never knowingly overridden, though a man could expiate his fault by throwing some small present on to the mat when he married a woman of his own totem in ignorance. If the woman accepted the present, there was no bar to the validity of the marriage."[1] However, in these latter cases the reports of the custom are too indefinite to allow us to decide whether among the Awisa and the Alungu all marriages of first cousins without exception are barred, or whether the prohibition applies only to marriages between the children of two brothers or of two sisters.

Cross-cousin marriage in East Africa.

Among the Wahehe, a tribe of German East Africa, a man may not marry his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother; but he is free to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, indeed such marriages are very common; in short, he is allowed to marry his cross-cousin, but forbidden to marry his ortho-cousin.[2] So with the Wagogo, another tribe of German East Africa, marriage is forbidden between ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, but it is permitted between cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively. But at the weddings of such cousins it is customary for the father of the bride to kill a sheep and put on a leathern armlet, otherwise the marriage, it is believed, would prove unfruitful.[3] Similarly, among the Sangos, another tribe of the same region, the marriage of ortho-cousins is forbidden and the marriage of cross-cousins is permitted, but

[1] J. C. C. Coxhead, *The Native Tribes of North-Eastern Rhodesia*, p. 41.

[2] E. Nigmann, *Die Wahehe* (Berlin, 1908), p. 60; O. Dempwolff, "Beiträge zur Volksbeschreibung der Hehe," *Baessler-Archiv*, iv. Heft 3 (Leipsic and Berlin, 1913), p. 103. The latter writer mentions the prohibition to marry an ortho-cousin, but not the permission to marry a cross-cousin.

[3] Heinrich Claus, *Die Wagogo* (Leipsic and Berlin, 1911), p. 58 (*Baessler-Archiv*, Beiheft ii.). The leathern armlet is probably made from the skin of the slaughtered sheep, though this is not mentioned by the writer. See above, pp. 6 *sqq.* We should expect the armlet to be worn by the bride rather than by her father; but the writer's words ("*ist es üblich, dass der Vater der Frau ein Schaf schlachtet und ein Lederarmband anlegt*") seem not to admit of this interpretation.

not favoured, the people preferring to take their wives from families with which they are not related.[1] Among the Bafioti, a Bantu people of West Africa, in the lower valley of the Congo, a man may not marry his ortho-cousin, the daughter of his father's brother; but he may marry his cross-cousin, the daughter of his father's sister. Apparently he is forbidden to marry his other cross-cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, for we are told that "a man may not marry any of his mother's family or relations whom he terms *Mama*."[2] Among the Ewe-speaking people of West Africa, who are pure negroes and do not belong to the Bantu race, marriage is forbidden between first cousins, the children either of two brothers or of two sisters; but it is allowed between two first cousins who are the children of a brother and a sister respectively. In other words, a man is free to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister; in short, the marriage of cross-cousins is allowed, and the marriage of ortho-cousins is forbidden.[3] Among the Yan Gido, a Hausa clan in Katsina (Northern Nigeria) the rule as to the marriage of cousins is precisely similar.[4] Among the Susu of Sierra Leone cross-cousin marriage is the rule.[5]

Cross-cousin marriage in West Africa.

Marriages with the daughter either of a father's brother or of a mother's brother are especially popular in modern Egypt.[6] This preference for marriage with the daughter of a father's brother has met us already among some Bantu tribes of South Africa.[7] It occurs also among the Malagasy who, while they prefer the marriage of first cousins who are the children of two brothers, on the other hand regard with horror the marriage of first cousins who are the children of two sisters. On this subject Mr. James Sibree, one of our best authori-

Cousin marriage in Egypt.

Cousin marriage in Madagascar.

[1] Missionar Heese, "Sitte und Brauch der Sango," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.F. xii. (1913) p. 134.

[2] R. E. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind* (London, 1906), p. 36.

[3] G. Zündel, "Land und Leute der Eweer auf der Sclavenküste in Westafrika," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, xii. (1877) p. 390.

[4] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 607, from information kindly supplied by Mr. H. R. Palmer, Resident in Charge of Katsina.

[5] Northcote W. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on Sierra Leone*, Part i. *Law and Custom* (London, 1916), p. 101.

[6] W. H. R. Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organisation* (London, 1914), p. 79. See further below, p. 258.

[7] Above, p. 151.

Marriage between cousins, the children of brothers.

ties on Madagascar, writes as follows: "Marriage between brothers' children is exceedingly common, and is looked upon as the most proper kind of connection, as keeping property together in the same family (the marriage of two persons nearly related to each other is called *lòva-tsi-mifìndra, i.e.* 'inheritance not removing'); and there does not seem to result from such marriages any of those consequences in idiocy and mental disorder of the offspring which are frequently seen in European nations as arising from the marriages of first cousins. It is possible, however, that to this marrying in and amongst tribes and families is due, in part at least, the sterility so frequent in Malagasy women. . . . Marriage between brothers' and sisters' children is also allowable on the performance of a slight prescribed ceremony, supposed to remove any impediment from consanguinity; but that of sisters' children, when the sisters have the same mother, is regarded with horror as incest, being emphatically *fàdy* or tabooed, and not allowable down to the fifth generation, that is, to the great-great-great-grandchildren of such two sisters."[1] To the same effect Messrs. Alfred and Guillaume Grandidier, in their authoritative work on Madagascar, report as follows: "We shall insist on the fact, to which we have already called attention, that if marriage between children and descendants of two sisters, that is, between uterine cousins who are collaterals on the mother's side, was *fadibé* (formally forbidden, incestuous in the highest degree), *mandokă* (a crime against nature), marriage between children and descendants of two brothers, that is, between consanguine cousins who are collaterals on the father's side, was considered desirable, especially among the Merina, and was often contracted after a sort of exorcism to *manala ondrană*, to remove the obstacles presented by consanguinity or, as is said in the South, to *manafaka tononў*, to avert the misfortunes which such an union might entail."[2]

[1] Rev. James Sibree, *The Great African Island, Chapters on Madagascar* (London), 1880, pp. 248 *sq.*; *id.*, "Relationships and the names used for them among the peoples of Madagascar, chiefly the Hovas," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, ix. (1880) p. 39. Compare A. van Gennep, *Tabou et Totémisme à Madagascar* (Paris, 1904), pp. 162 *sq.*

[2] Alfred Grandidier et Guillaume Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagas-*

Expiation for marriage between cousins.

Elsewhere the same writers inform us that among the Malagasy marriage between cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, as well as between cousins, the children of two brothers, was permissible on the performance of a sacrifice intended to remove the impediment to such unions. The sacrifice took place in the village of the bride's parents, and the victim was an ox, a sheep, or a fowl, according to the degree of relationship between the bridal pair and their wealth or poverty; for blood is deemed necessary to ensure the blessing of God and of the ancestors on a marriage of this sort. In some of the northern clans the newly wedded couple are sprinkled with cow's dung, mixed with boiled rice, as a means of removing the impediment to their union; and they believe that, if they did not undergo this aspersion, they would die young or would fall innocent victims to the poison ordeal, whenever a false charge should be brought against them.[1]

In some African tribes, especially of the Bantu stock, the marriage of all first cousins is absolutely prohibited.

But while the custom of marriage with certain first cousins is widespread among the aborigines of Africa, especially among those of the Bantu stock, it is not universal; on the contrary there are some tribes which prohibit more or less strictly all marriages whatsoever between cousins. Some prohibitions, apparently universal, of cousin marriages in Africa have already been recorded;[2] but, as I have indicated, in these cases it is not clear whether the prohibitions are really universal or only apply to certain cases of cousin marriage, particularly to marriages between the children of brothers or the children of sisters. However, there are a certain number of Bantu tribes in which all marriages between cousins, without distinction, appear to have been positively forbidden. Thus in the Uganda Protectorate there is a compact group of four tribes, the Baganda, the Banyoro, the Basoga, and the Bateso, in which the marriage of all first cousins was unlawful. At the same time all four tribes allowed marriage between second cousins in certain cases, namely, when the

The marriage of first cousins unlawful among the Baganda, Banyoro, Basoga, and Bateso.

---

car, ii. (Paris, 1914), p. 167 (*Histoire Physique, Naturelle et Politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv.) Compare G. Grandidier, "Le Mariage à Madagascar," *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, vi. Série iv. (1913), p. 23.

[1] A. et G. Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. 149 *sq.*

[2] See above, pp. 151, 154, 155 *sq.*

second cousins were the grandchildren of a brother and sister respectively, and when, moreover, the father of one of the second cousins was a son of that brother, and the mother of the other second cousin was a daughter of that sister. In short, a man's children might not marry his sister's children, but a man's son's children might marry his sister's daughter's children.[1] Amongst the Baganda so stringent was the prohibition of marriage between cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, that the punishment for a breach of it was death.[2] This certainly is a striking contrast to the usage of other Bantu tribes, who regularly permit or even specially favour such unions between cousins. But among the Baganda cross-cousins were not only forbidden to marry each other under pain of death; they might not even enter the same house nor eat out of the same dish; a man's first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, was not allowed to approach him or to hand him anything. If the cousins failed to observe these restrictions, it was believed that they would fall ill, so that their hands would tremble and they would be unfit for any work. But these rules of avoidance did not apply to ortho-cousins, the children either of two brothers or of two sisters; these cousins were regarded as brothers and sisters and might intermingle freely with each other.[3]

Cross-cousins obliged to avoid each other among the Baganda.

This distinction between the behaviour to each other of different classes of cousins is very significant. The custom of mutual avoidance between persons of opposite sexes is almost certainly in origin a precaution intended to prevent improper

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 460 *sq.*, 463, 508, 522, from information furnished by the Rev. John Roscoe; J. Roscoe, *The Baganda* (London, 1911), pp. 128 *sq.*, 131, 132; *id.*, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 38 (the Banyoro), 209 (the Basoga), p. 263 (the Bateso). The general prohibition of marriage between first cousins is mentioned by Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate* (London, 1904), ii. 688, 695.

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 129, 131, 132.

[3] Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, ii. 695; J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 128 *sq.* Sir Harry Johnston mentions the rules of avoidance between cousins in general, without noticing that these rules apply only to cross-cousins. Mr. Roscoe does not expressly say that cousins who are the children of two brothers might intermingle freely with each other, but he apparently implies it by saying (p. 129) that the father's brothers' children "were brothers and sisters to his children," and that "the mother's sisters' children were brothers and sisters to her own children, and might intermingle freely with them."

relations between persons who might conceivably be betrayed into them.[1] Accordingly when we find that among the Baganda such rules of avoidance are observed between cross-cousins (children of a brother and a sister respectively), but not between ortho-cousins (children of two brothers or of two sisters), the inference to be drawn from the distinction is that sexual intercourse is thought to be possible, though very undesirable, between cross-cousins, but impossible between ortho-cousins, who are put on a level with brothers and sisters. From this again we may infer that the distinction between cross-cousins and ortho-cousins is extremely ancient, and that the prohibition of sexual intercourse between ortho-cousins had been so long in force that the observance of it had grown into an instinct which, like the similar prohibition of sexual intercourse between brothers and sisters, needed no extraneous safeguard among normal persons; but that, on the other hand, the prohibition of sexual intercourse between cross-cousins was so comparatively recent that it had not yet acquired the force of a long-established custom, and therefore needed to be guarded by the special precaution of a strict mutual avoidance between the cross-cousins. If this inference is correct, it will follow that among the Baganda, as among many other Bantu tribes of Africa, the marriage of cross-cousins had continued to be lawful, and perhaps popular, long after the marriage of ortho-cousins had been strictly forbidden. Later on we shall find a precisely similar rule of avoidance observed for similar reasons among the aborigines of New Ireland.[2]

The mutual avoidance of cross-cousins among the Baganda seems to show that the prohibition of marriage between them is of much more recent origin than the prohibition of marriage between ortho-cousins, who are not subject to any such restrictions in their social intercourse with each other.

The Akikuyu of British East Africa appear to carry the prohibition of cousin marriage still further than the Baganda, for they are reported to bar the marriage of second cousins as well as the marriage of first cousins; whereas the Baganda, as we have seen, allow the marriage of second cousins in certain cases. The marriage of first and second cousins, the children and grandchildren of brothers and sisters, is regarded by the Akikuyu as a grave sin, and they believe that, if it has been knowingly contracted, the children begotten of such an unhallowed union will surely die;

Among the Akikuyu the marriage both of first and of second cousins is forbidden.

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 108 *sqq.*; *Psyche's Task*, Second Edition (London, 1913), pp. 88 *sqq.*

[2] See below, p. 183.

for in their judgment the sin is visited on the innocent offspring and not on the guilty parents, and no blood of sheep or other ceremonial detergent can wash out the deep stain (*thahu*) that rests on the misbegotten brats. On the other hand, if the sin of the parents has been committed unwittingly, that is in ignorance of the relationship between them, the defilement (*thahu*), which would otherwise prove fatal to the children, can be removed as follows. The elders take a sheep, place it on the shoulders of the guilty wife, and there and then butcher the animal. While its warm blood gushes over her body, the elders draw out the guts from the carcass, and solemnly sever them with a sharp splinter of wood cut from a bush of a particular kind, while they announce that they are severing the bond of blood relationship which exists between the pair.[1]

Expiation for the marriage of cousins.

Again, among the Thonga, a Bantu tribe of Portuguese East Africa, the marriage of cousins, even in the fourth, sixth, eighth, and tenth degrees, is prohibited; indeed two persons are forbidden to marry each other if it can be shown that they have a single common ancestor, however remote. The prohibition is particularly stringent when the relationship is traced through males; it is sometimes relaxed after four generations when the relationship is traced through women. In such cases the husband has to pay a sum in addition to the customary bride-price for the purpose, as they say, of "killing the relationship" (*dlaya shilongo*), after which the tie of consanguinity is supposed to be severed.[2] But in

Marriage of cousins prohibited among the Thonga.

Expiation for the marriage of cousins: "killing the relationship."

[1] C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 438.

[2] Henri A. Junod, *Les Ba-Ronga* (Neuchâtel, 1898), pp. 84-86; compare *id.*, *Life of a South African Tribe* (Neuchâtel, 1912-1913), i. 241 *sqq.* The Ba-Ronga are the portion of the Thonga tribe who are settled about Delagoa Bay. Mr. Junod's exposition of the subject in his earlier work is clearer than that in his later work, and I have followed it in the text. It seems to apply particularly to the Ba-Ronga branch of the Thonga tribe. In his later work (*Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 241) he says, "Amongst the Ba-Ronga, it is taboo for a boy to marry a girl when both can lay claim to a common ancestor in the paternal line. It seems that the rule is not so stringent in the Northern clans. According to Mankhelu, marriage is absolutely prohibited between all the descendants of a grandfather, viz. between first cousins. Between second cousins it is permitted conditionally, 'by killing the family tie,' and between third cousins it is allowed. . . . On the mother's side, this absolute prohibition extends to first cousins when mothers are sisters."

order to sever the bond of blood and so permit the cousins to marry, it is not enough to pay a ransom, an expiatory sacrifice must be offered; otherwise the marriage would be unlucky and the wife could not bear children. To avert these evils a goat is sacrificed, and the couple, sitting on the same mat, are anointed with the green liquid extracted from the half-digested grass in the animal's stomach. Then the goat's skin is taken and put on the heads of the two cousins, and through a hole cut in the middle of the skin the raw liver of the animal is handed down to them; they must tear it out with their teeth and swallow it; they may not use a knife to cut the liver. The word for liver (*shibindji*) means also "patience, determination." So they say to the pair, "You have acted with strong determination. Eat the liver now. It will be an offering to the gods." Then the priest of the family prays, saying, "You, our gods, so and so, look! We have done it in the daylight. It has not been done by stealth. Bless them, give them children." When the priest has done praying, the assistants take all the half-digested grass from the animal's stomach and place it on the wife's head, saying, "Go and bear children."[1]

The marriage of cousins thought to be infertile.

This ceremony and the accompanying prayer prove that in the opinion of the Thonga the marriage of near relations, including cousins, is apt to be infertile, unless means are taken to sever the tie of kinship between the parties, and so to place them in the position of unrelated persons. The bond of kinship is clearly conceived in a concrete, material sense, since it is represented by the goat's liver, which the couple sever with their teeth. Similarly, as we saw, the Akikuyu identify the bond of relationship with sheep's guts, and think that by cutting the guts they simultaneously sever the tie of blood which unites the cousins. And as the

The bond of kinship conceived as physical.

[1] Henri A. Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 243-245. This description applies to the ceremony as it is performed by the northern clans of the Thonga tribe, among whom the prohibition of cousin marriage is apparently not so stringent as among the Ba-Ronga to the south (see the preceding note). Among the Ronga clans the ceremony of "killing the relationship" (*dlaya shilongo*) is somewhat different; in Mr. Junod's description of it nothing is said about the use of the goat's skin in the ritual. He tells us that the aim of the ceremony "is to lawfully kill one kind of relationship and to replace it by another, because the two are not compatible." See Henri A. Junod, *Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 245 *sq.*

Thonga imagine that, without the performance of the expiatory rite, the marriage of the cousins would prove infertile, so the Akikuyu believe that, without a similar atonement, the offspring of the cousins could not live. So, too, the Wagogo hold that the marriage of cousins would be unfruitful, unless a sheep were killed and apparently an armlet made from its skin to be worn by the bride's father.[1]

Marriage of cousins barred among the Wabemba and Wahorohoro.

Among the Wabemba and the Wahorohoro, two tribes, apparently Bantu, to the west of Lake Tanganyika, even the most distant cousinship forms a bar to marriage. More than that, among the Wahorohoro a man is bound to avoid his female cousin. He may not speak to her nor remain in her company. If she enters a house where he happens to be, he will at once depart.[2] We have seen that among the Baganda cousins have to observe similar rules of mutual avoidance.[3]

Marriage of cousins barred among the Masai.

Another African people who bar all marriages both of first and of second cousins are the Masai, the well-known tribe of herdsmen and warriors, who were long the terror of their neighbours in East Africa. They do not belong to the Bantu stock, but are members of the family to which the name Nilotic is now commonly given, because many of the tribes included in it have their seats in the upper valley of the Nile.[4] Among the Masai, "first cousins and second cousins may not marry, but there is no objection to third cousins marrying if the relationship is no nearer than *ol-le 'sōtwa* (or *en-e- 'sōtwa*). Thus a man's son's son's son may not marry the man's brother's son's son's daughter, nor may a man's son's son's son marry the sister's son's son's daughter, but there would be no objection to a man's son's son's son marrying the brother's daughter's daughter's daughter or the sister's daughter's daughter's daughter. Likewise though a man's son's son may not marry the man's maternal uncle's son's son's daughter, he may marry the maternal uncle's son's

[1] Above, p. 156.

[2] Charles Delhaise, *Notes Ethnographiques sur quelques peuplades du Tanganika* (Brussels, 1905), pp. 10, 35.

[3] Above, p. 160.

[4] Sir Charles Eliot's "Introduction" to A. C. Hollis's *The Masai* (Oxford, 1905), pp. xi *sqq*.

daughter's daughter. These unions are always contingent on the two parties not belonging to the same sub-clan."[1] If a Masai man knowingly commits incest by marrying a cousin whom he ought not to marry, he is punished by his relations, who flog him and slaughter some of his cattle. If the crime has been committed unwittingly, as may easily happen, for example, when distant cousins live in different districts, the man must present a cow to the girl's kinsfolk in order to "kill the relationship" (*a-ar eng-anyit*).[2] On the analogy of the Kikuyu and Thonga parallels, we may conjecture that the "killing of the relationship" is effected by killing the cow and severing its guts or other internal organs with which the bond of blood uniting the two cousins is assumed, for the purpose of the ceremony, to be identified.

Expiation for the marriage of cousins: "killing the relationship."

Among the Yorubas, a large and important race of pure negroes in West Africa, marriage with blood relations is forbidden, both on the father's and on the mother's side, so far as the relationship can be traced; but in practice the prohibition appears not to be extended beyond second cousins.[3]

Marriage of cousins barred among the Yorubas.

§ 7. *The Marriage of Cousins in the Indian Archipelago*

Among the peoples of the Indian Archipelago, who may be designated by the general name of Indonesians, there are some who permit or even encourage marriage with a first cousin, particularly with the daughter of a mother's brother, while there are others who strictly forbid such unions as incestuous.

Cousin marriage among the Indonesians.

Thus, among the Bataks or Battas of Central Sumatra a man is not allowed to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his father's sister, but on the other hand he is under a moral obligation to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother. Such marriages of men with the daughters of their mothers' brothers, or, in other words, of women with

Cross-cousin marriage among the Bataks of Sumatra.

[1] A. C. Hollis, "A Note on the Masai System of Relationship and other matters connected therewith," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 479.

A. C. Hollis, "A Note on the Masai System of Relationship," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 480.

[3] (Sir) A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa* (London, 1894), p. 188.

the sons of their fathers' sisters, are so interwoven, we are told, into the Batak ideas of family life, on which the whole fabric of their social life is based, that a girl seldom seeks to evade the union which custom assigns to her. A damsel has been known to refuse several good offers and to accept the hand of her cousin, the son of her father's sister, though the young man had nothing to recommend him and was in fact inferior both in person and in wealth to the suitors whom she had rejected. Asked why she had chosen such an undesirable bridegroom, when she might have made a much better match, she simply answered, "It is our custom. What else would you do?" On the other hand, if a young man were so ungallant as to jilt his cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, in favour of another girl, there might be bad blood between him and his uncle, the father of the rejected damsel; indeed, some people say that the gods themselves would be angry at such a breach of traditionary usage. Thus among the Bataks the union of a man with his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, is the normal and most orthodox form of marriage. On the other hand, marriage with a first cousin, the daughter of a father's sister, is not only forbidden but punishable. Of such a marriage the Bataks say, "How is it possible that water can flow up to its source?" Only in the third generation may the descendants of such cousins marry each other; in other words, the great-grandchildren of such cousins can contract a lawful marriage, being themselves fourth cousins.[1] So sharp a distinction do the Bataks draw between a mother's brother's daughter and a father's sister's daughter.

Cross-cousin marriage among the Looboos and Rejangs of Sumatra.

Similarly among the Looboos, a primitive tribe of unknown origin in Mandailing, a western district of Sumatra, custom requires that a man should by preference marry a daughter of his mother's brother. The formalities attending the wedding of these first cousins are very small. The people regard such a marriage as a matter of course, and they say

[1] J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bila-stroomgebied op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, iii. Afdeeling, Meer uitgebreide Artikelen, No. 2 (Amsterdam, 1886), p. 243, No. 3, p. 492; M. Joustra, "Het leven, de zeden en gewoonten der Bataks," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xlvi. (1902) p. 390.

of it that "the leech rolls towards the open wound."[1] Indeed this preference for marriage with such a cousin seems to be general in Mandailing, for we are told that in this part of Sumatra marriage with the daughter of a mother's brother is deemed very desirable, whereas marriage with the daughter of a father's sister is forbidden.[2] Similarly among the Rejangs of Sumatra the rule is that "of two brothers, the children may not intermarry. A sister's son may marry a brother's daughter; but a brother's son may not marry a sister's daughter."[3]

Cross-cousin marriage in the Kei Islands.

Again, in the Kei Islands a youth of a rich family is bound to marry a girl of his mother's family, by preference a first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, to whom, indeed, he has usually been betrothed since childhood. If his mother's brother has no daughter, he must adopt one and give her to his sister's son to wife. If he has a daughter, but she is still too young to wed, her cousin must wait for her till she is nubile. If he fails to carry out his obligation to marry his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, he or his family has to pay a heavy fine. On the other hand, a similar fine would be inflicted on him if he were to marry a girl of his father's family, say a first cousin, a daughter of his father's sister, for such a marriage is regarded as incest.[4]

Cross-cousin marriage in the islands between New Guinea and Celebes.

Again, in the islands of Saparua, Haruku, and Nussa Laut, and on part of the southern coast of Ceram, a man's daughters and his sister's sons are marriageable; indeed, marriages between such first cousins would seem to be customary. Even before marriage these cousins may take all sorts of liberties with each other, laughing, joking, romping, and so forth, without being checked for it by their parents. And should a man marry another woman, he may still after

[1] J. Kreemer, "De Loeboes in Mandailing," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxvi. (1912) p. 321.

[2] H. Ris, "De onderafdeeling Klein Mandailing Oeloe en Pahantan en hare bevolking met uitzondering van de Oeloes," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, xlvi. (1896) p. 508; Th. A. L. Heyting, "Beschrijving der Onderafdeeling Groot-Mandailing en Batang-natal," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, xiv. (1897) pp. 245 *sq.*, 257.

[3] W. Marsden, *History of Sumatra* (London, 1811), p. 228.

[4] C. M. Pleyte, "Ethnographische beschrijving der Kei-Eilanden," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, x. (1893) p. 808.

marriage use the same freedom with his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, and his wife ought not to take it ill, nay, she should encourage him so to do. Such cousins have a special name (*anakh makaien*); and a man usually calls such a cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, "my wife." On the other hand, a man's sons and his sister's daughters are thought to stand in a near relationship to each other, like brothers and sisters, and they may not intermarry; in other words, a man is forbidden to take to wife his first cousin, the daughter of his father's sister.[1] Similarly the Alfoors of Nusawele in the island of Ceram forbid marriage between the children of two brothers, between the children of two sisters, and between a man's son and his sister's daughter, but they allow a man's daughter to marry his sister's son; in other words, they bar the marriage of all first cousins except the marriage of a man with the daughter of his mother's brother; indeed marriages of this last sort are much favoured. On the other hand, in the neighbouring district of Mansela, marriage is allowed between the children of brothers and also between the children of sisters, but this permission appears to be an innovation on ancient custom; at least we are told that formerly in Mansela the rule seems to have been different and to have conformed to the present practice of Nusawele.[2] Again, in Endeh, a district of the island of Flores, the marriage of cross-cousins is very common, and is permissible in both forms; that is, a man may marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister. On the other hand, ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, are not marriageable; in other words, a man may not marry the daughter of his father's brother or the daughter of his mother's sister.[3] In Central Manggarai, a district of

Cross-cousin marriage in Ceram.

Cross-cousin marriage in Flores.

[1] Van Schmid, "Aanteekeningen nopens de zeden, gewoonten en gebruiken, benevens de vooroordeelen en bijgeloovigheden der bevolking van de eilanden Saparoea, Haroekoe, Noessa Laut, en van een gedeelte van de zuidkust van Ceram, in vroegeren en lateren tijd," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands Indië*, Vijfde Jaargang, Tweede Deel (Batavia, 1843), pp. 596 *sq.*

[2] M. C. Schadee, "Heirats und andere Gebräuche bei den Mansela und Nasawele Alfuren in der Unterabteilung Wahasi der Insel Seram (Ceram)," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xxii. (1915) p. 134.

[3] S. Roos, "Iets over Endeh," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, xxiv. (1878) p. 523.

Western Flores, we are told that people, so far as possible, should marry within the family, that is cousin with cousin ;[1] but though no distinction of cousins is mentioned, we may conjecture that the rule in Central Manggarai is subject to the same limitation as in Endeh, cross-cousins being allowed, or rather expected, to marry each other, while ortho-cousins are forbidden to do so. Again, in the island of Keisar or Makisar, cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, are allowed to marry ; indeed, they are betrothed in their childhood, between the ages of five and seven, and the brother and sister seal this compact of marriage between their children by drinking arrack out of the same glass. Should either of them afterwards break the covenant, he or she must pay a fine. But on the other hand, ortho-cousins, the children either of two brothers or of two sisters, are forbidden to marry each other ; in other words, a man may not marry the daughter of his father's brother or of his mother's sister.[2] In the Aru Islands first cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, are free to marry each other, but first cousins, the children of two brothers, are not.[3] Again, in the islands of Leti, Moa, and Lakor first cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, are at liberty to marry each other, but this privilege is denied to first cousins, the children of two sisters.[4]

Cross-cousin marriage in Keisar, the Aru Islands, etc.

The Macassars and Bugineeze of Southern Celebes permit marriage between full cousins.[5] So, too, among the Baré'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes marriage between cousins of all grades is unconditionally allowed ; but a male cousin may not marry his female cousin once removed, who

Cousin marriage in Celebes.

[1] J. W. Meerburg, "Proeve einer beschrijving van land en volk van Midden-Manggarai (West Flores), Afdeeling Bima," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, xxxiv. (1891) p. 466.

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (The Hague, 1886), pp. 416, 474.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 250. From a note on p. 474 of the same work it appears that in these islands the children of two sisters (though not of two brothers) are allowed to marry each other.

[4] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.* p. 385. From a note on p. 474 of the same work it appears that in these islands the children of two brothers (though not of two sisters) are allowed to marry each other.

[5] G. A. Wilken, "Over de verwantschap en het huwelijks- en erfrecht bij de volken van het maleische ras," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), i. 360.

Expiation for marriage with a cousin once removed.

necessarily belongs to the generation below his own. If, however, such a marriage has been contracted and has been detected, the culprits are obliged to separate from each other and to atone for their guilt by a sacrifice. For that purpose they are conducted by the elders, along with the sacrificial victims, to the bank of a brook. There one of the elders prays to the gods to remove the guilt that has been incurred by the marriage, and to cause the rice and all the other products of the fields to thrive. Then the victims, consisting of a buffalo, a pig, a goat, and a fowl, are slain, and small pieces of the animals, together with a fowl's egg, betel, tobacco, and one or two doits, are put into a miniature ship. Moreover, a garment of each of the guilty persons, sprinkled with the blood of the sacrificial victims, is also laid in the tiny vessel; however, in some places the blood-stained garments are not put into the little ship, but buried in the ground. Then the company sits down to feast on the flesh of the sacrificial victims; all the meat must be consumed on the spot, nothing may be taken home. If they cannot eat the whole at one sitting, they hang the remnant on the boughs of neighbouring trees, and come next day to finish it off. After the meal the two culprits stand up and receive a symbolic castigation, which consists in seven strokes with branches of the *Rubus pungens* and stalks of the *Scleria scrobiculata*. The former plant, the native raspberry, is plentifully provided with prickles, the latter is a sharp-edged grass; both therefore are calculated to make a painful impression on the backs of the sinners. The demands of justice being thus satisfied, the little ship, with the offerings and the blood-stained clothes, is allowed to drift down with the current; after which the whole company sprinkle water on each other and then scamper home, not by the road they came, but through fresh untrodden ways in the wilderness, in order to give the slip to the avenging spirits, who, refusing to make any compromise with sin, will give chase to the culprits, but in the innocence of their heart will pursue them along the old familiar path that leads to the village. This expiatory ceremony is performed not only to wipe out the guilt of a marriage of a male cousin with his female cousin once removed, but also to atone for graver cases of incest,

such as that of a grandfather with his granddaughter, of a father with his daughter, or of a brother with his sister. All these crimes are believed to blight the rice crops and would be punished with death, if the sinners did not humbly confess their sin, atone for it with the blood of buffaloes, pigs, goats, and fowls, and submit their persons to chastisement with the sharp-edged grass and the prickly raspberries.[1]

The marriage of cousins barred by some peoples of Celebes.

But while the Toradjas of Central Celebes appear to permit marriages between cousins of all grades, provided the cousins belong to the same generation, other peoples of the same great island are more scrupulous in this respect. Thus in the Palu, Dolo, Sigi, and Beromaru districts of Central Celebes marriage between first cousins, the children of two sisters, is forbidden; the people believe that such a marriage would anger the spirits, and that the rice and maize harvests would fail in consequence. When such a crime has been detected, the guilty cousins are theoretically tied together, weighted with stones, and thrown into the water. Practically, however, they are let off with their lives, and a buffalo or a goat dies as a vicarious sacrifice. Its blood, mixed with water, is sprinkled on the rice-fields and the maize-fields,[2] no doubt to restore to them the fertility of which otherwise the marriage of the cousins would, in popular opinion, unquestionably bereave them. Again, in Minahassa, a province in the north-eastern extremity of Celebes, all marriages between cousins are prohibited or tabooed (*posan*), on the alleged ground that such unions would make the parents of the cousins ashamed.[3] However, in Bolaang Mongondou, a kingdom of Minahassa, if a marriage between cousins should take place, the parents on both sides must

Expiation for the marriage of cousins.

[1] N. Adriani en A. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), ii. 8-11, 246-248. It is remarkable that while, according to the authors, marriage is freely permitted between cousins of all grades, provided they belong to the same generation, nevertheless all cousins call each other elder or younger brothers or sisters (*op. cit.* ii. 8 *sq.*). Such designations commonly exclude the right of marriage between the persons who apply these terms to each other.

[2] Hissink, "Nota van toelichting, betreffende de zelbesturende landschappen Paloe, Dolo, Sigi en Beromaroe," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, liv. (1912) p. 115.

[3] De C[lercq], "Iets over het bijgeloof in de Minahasa," *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, July 1870, p. 3. Compare G. A. Wilken, "Over de verwantschap en het huwelijks- en erfrecht bij de volken van het maleische ras," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), i. 310.

kill a goat and smear blood from its ears on the house-ladders of the king and the headman, no doubt as an expiation for the crime.[1] Marriages between cousins are forbidden by the Javanese.[2]

The marriage of cousins barred in British Borneo.

Among the native tribes of Borneo there seems to be a general objection to the marriage of first cousins, though in some places such marriages are tolerated on condition of the payment of a fine or the performance of an expiatory ceremony. Thus with regard to the Land Dyaks of Sarawak, Sir Spenser St. John tells us that among them "the prohibited degrees seem to be the same as adopted among ourselves: marriage with a deceased wife's sister, it is said, is prohibited, as well as that between first cousins; and second cousins are only permitted after the exchange of a fine of a jar, the woman paying it to the relations of her lover, and he to her relations."[3] And with regard to the Sea Dyaks of Sarawak he says, "It is contrary to custom for a man to marry a first cousin, who is looked upon as a sister."[4] To the same effect Sir Charles Brooke, Rajah of Sarawak, writes as follows: "On the subject of marrying in and in, it is to be observed that Dyak customs prohibit any near consanguineous nuptials, and they are more particular in this respect than Europeans. They consider first cousins in the light of brothers and sisters, and a further removal only entitles a customary marriage. Nieces are not allowed to marry their uncles, nor nephews their aunts. They are particular in these points, and the person who disregards them is harshly reproached and heavily mulcted."[5] Similarly Messrs. Hose and McDougall report that among these tribes "incest is regarded very seriously, and the forbidden

[1] N. P. Wilken en J. A. Schwartz, "Allerlei over het land en volk van Bolaang Mongondou," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xi. (1867) p. 318.

[2] G. A. Wilken, "Huwelijken tusschen bloedverwanten," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), ii. 351.

[3] (Sir) Spenser St. John, *Life in the Forests of the Far East*, Second Edition (London, 1863), i. 208 *sq.*

[4] (Sir) Spenser St. John, *op. cit.* i. 85. Compare Hugh Low, *Sarawak* (London, 1848), p. 300, "Incest is held in abhorrence, and even the marriage of cousins is not allowed"; E. H. Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo* (London, 1911), p. 128, "The Dyaks are very particular as to their prohibitive degrees, and are opposed to the marriage of relatives. The prohibitive degrees are much the same as among Christians."

[5] (Sir) Charles Brooke, *Ten Years in Sarawak* (London, 1866), ii. 336 *sq.*

degrees of kinship are clearly defined. They are very similar to those recognised among ourselves. . . . First cousins may marry, but such marriages are not regarded with favour, and certain special ceremonies are necessitated; and it seems to be the general opinion that such marriages are not likely to prove happy."[1] What the ceremonies are which custom requires in order to render the marriage of first cousins legitimate, these writers do not tell us, but they have been described by another authority. "The Sea Dyaks," he tells us, "are very particular as to their prohibited degrees of marriage, and are opposed in principle to the inter-marriage of relatives. This is one reason for the fertility of their women as compared with other tribes who are fast vanishing around them." Among them, the same writer goes on, a man "may not marry his first cousin, except he perform a special act called *bergaput* to avert evil consequences to the land. The couple adjourn to the waterside and fill a small earthenware jar with their personal ornaments; this they sink in the river, or instead of a jar they fling a *duku* (chopper) and a plate into the river. A pig is then sacrificed on the bank, and its carcase, drained of its blood, is flung in after the jar. The pair are then pushed into the water by their friends and ordered to bathe together. A joint of bamboo is then filled with pig's blood, and they have to perambulate the country, scattering it upon the ground and in the villages round about. They are then free to marry."[2] Another witness, who records a similar expiation for the marriage of first cousins among the Undup Dyaks, was told by the people that the ceremony was not performed in honour of any evil spirit, but in order that their rice might not be blasted.[3] Thus the atonement for the marriage of cousins among the Sea Dyaks of Sarawak resembles the atonement for a similar enormity among various peoples of Celebes.[4] In both islands the idea seems to be that the marriage of first cousins is a crime which, either in itself or through the divine wrath it excites, threatens to

Expiation for the marriage of cousins.

[1] Charles Hose and William McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo* (London, 1912), i. 73 *sq.*

[2] Brooke Low, quoted by H. Ling Roth, *The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo* (London, 1896), i. 122 *sq.*

[3] Crossland, quoted by H. Ling Roth, *op. cit.* i. 123.

[4] See above, pp. 170-172.

blight all the fruits of the earth, and that fertility can only be restored to the ground by libations of blood, particularly of pig's blood, which, in the opinion of not a few peoples, possesses a singular efficacy for the atonement of moral guilt, above all the guilt of incest.[1]

The marriage of cousins barred in Dutch Borneo.

So far the evidence for the aversion to cousin marriage in Borneo has been drawn from those portions of that great island which are under British rule; but the same dislike of the marriage of near relations appears also on the whole to prevail among the tribes of Dutch Borneo. Thus, in the districts of Landak and Tajan the penalty for incest between brothers and sisters, parents and children, uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews, is death. "Further, in Landak and Tajan the marriage between the children of brothers, the children of sisters, and between the children of brothers and sisters, in other words, between full cousins, is absolutely prohibited. However, among the Segelam, Tjempedi, and Bekat Dyaks of Tajan such a marriage is permissible on the payment of a fine. Among the Melian Dyaks there is absolutely no prohibition of such marriages."[2] Among the cases of incest which the tribes of Dutch Borneo punish with death by drowning, another writer mentions the marriage or sexual intercourse of parents with children, of brothers with sisters, and of uncles and aunts with nieces and nephews, but he says nothing about the marriage of cousins, and from his silence on the subject we may perhaps infer that in the tribes with which he was acquainted such marriages were permitted, or at least winked at, possibly in consideration of the payment of a fine and the usual effusion of pig's blood.[3] Among the Kayans of Dutch Borneo, "not only are marriages between blood relations forbidden, but marriages between persons connected by marriage, as brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, are also prohibited. Hence the few chiefs on the Mendalam River who,

[1] For evidence see *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, ii. 107 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part i.); *Psyche's Task*, Second Edition, pp. 44 *sqq.*

[2] M. C. Schadee, "Het familienleven en familierecht der Dajaks van Landak en Tajan," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxiii. (1910) p. 438.

[3] M. T. H. Perelaer, *Ethnographische Beschrijving der Dajaks* (Zalt-Bommel, 1870), pp. 59 *sq.* The statement no doubt refers to the Dyaks of those parts of Eastern and Southern Borneo in which the writer occupied an official post.

for political reasons, have to marry relations, must at marriage pay a fine for this breach of customary law (*adat*)." [1]

§ 8. *The Marriage of Cousins in New Guinea and the Torres Straits Islands*

The marriage of cousins apparently discountenanced in New Guinea. The question of cousin marriage in German New Guinea.

There seems to be no evidence that the marriage of first cousins is permitted, much less favoured, in any part of New Guinea; but we possess so little exact information as to the social system of the tribes which inhabit that vast island, that it would be unsafe to infer the absence of the custom from the silence of our authorities. Among the Yabim, a tribe who speak a Melanesian language and inhabit the country at the entrance to Huon Gulf in German New Guinea, marriage may not take place between the children of brothers and sisters, nor between the children of these children; in other words, marriages between first cousins and between second cousins are prohibited.[2] However, according to another good authority on this tribe, the German missionary, Konrad Vetter, "the only bars to marriage among near kin are the relationships between the children of brothers and sisters, and between uncles and nieces".;[3] which seems to imply that, while the marriage of first cousins is forbidden, the marriage of second cousins is not.

The marriage of first cousins forbidden, but the marriage of more remote cousins permitted, in some tribes of British New Guinea.

Among the natives of the Mekeo district, in British New Guinea, "marriage by a man with any girl related to him in the male line is forbidden, however distant her relationship to him may be. But he may marry a girl whose relationship with him is in the female line, provided that his and her parents are sufficiently removed in relationship from each other. For example, marriage between the children of two sisters (first cousins) is not allowed, and even marriage between the children of those children (second cousins) is not strictly regular, though as regards the latter they constantly shut their eyes to the irregularity and permit it." [4] Among

[1] A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *Quer durch Borneo* (Leyden, 1904–1907), i. 86.

[2] H. Zahn, "Die Jabim," in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea* (Berlin, 1911), iii. 299.

[3] K. Vetter, in *Nachrichten über Kaiser-Wilhelms-Land und den Bismarck-Archipel, 1897* (Berlin), p. 89.

[4] R. W. Williamson, "Some unrecorded customs of the Mekeo people of British New Guinea," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 275.

the Koiari, a Melanesian tribe near Port Moresby, in British New Guinea, "relatives do not marry, as they say it is one blood. Cousins of several degrees are called brothers and sisters."[1] Again, among the Koita, a neighbouring tribe who also belong to the Melanesian stock, "the regulation of marriage depends on the avoidance of marriage within the forbidden degrees, which extend to third cousins."[2] The Mafulus, an inland tribe of the Mekeo district, "have their prohibitive rules of consanguinity; but these are based merely upon the number of generations between either party and the common ancestor. The number of degrees within which prohibition applies in this way is two, thus taking it to the grandparent; and the result is that no man or woman may properly marry any descendant of his or her paternal or maternal grandfather or grandmother, however distant the actual relationship of the persons concerned may be. Marriages within the prohibited degree do in fact occur; but they are discountenanced, and are rare." Thus among the Mafulus the blood-relationship which serves as a bar to marriage "only extends, as between people of the same generation, to first cousins. But a Mafulu native who was grandson of the common ancestor would be prohibited from marrying his first cousin once removed (great-granddaughter of that ancestor), or his first cousin twice removed (great-great-granddaughter of that ancestor)"[3] These Mafulus appear to belong neither to the Melanesian nor to the Papuan stock, which between them inhabit the greater part of New Guinea. They are believed to be a pygmy or Negrito people, who have been modified by Papuan and perhaps Melanesian influence.[4] In the island of Tubetube, which lies off the south-eastern extremity of New Guinea, and is inhabited by people of the same stock as their neighbours on the mainland, "the nearest consanguineous marriage permitted is between the children of Nubaili (the third generation), and

[1] Rev. James Chalmers, "Report on New Guinea, Toaripi and Koiari tribes," *Report of the Second Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Melbourne, Victoria, in January 1890* (Sydney), p. 320.

[2] C. G. Seligmann, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 82.

[3] Robert W. Williamson, *The Mafulu, Mountain People of British New Guinea* (London, 1912), p. 169.

[4] A. C. Haddon, "Introduction" to R. W. Williamson, *The Mafulu*, p. xxiii.

even then the grandchildren of two sisters, their Tubuli (grandmothers), cannot intermarry. But the grandchildren of two brothers can marry the grandchildren of two sisters if they do not belong to the same totem." [1] From this we gather that in Tubetube no marriage between first cousins is permissible, but that second cousins may marry each other, provided that they are the grandchildren of a brother and a sister respectively; whereas they might not marry each other if they were the grandchildren of two sisters.

Similar rules as to the marriage of cousins in the western islands of Torres Straits.

The inhabitants of the western islands of Torres Straits, immediately to the south of New Guinea, appear to share the aversion to marriages between near relations. On this subject the statements of the natives and the results of a genealogical record taken among them are in agreement, and seem to show that in these islands marriages between first cousins never, or very rarely, occur, while marriages between distant cousins, such as third cousins or second cousins once removed, are permitted, and not infrequent; nevertheless "in nearly all these marriages the relationship is either very remote (third cousins or second cousins once removed) or there are extenuating circumstances." [2] On the other hand in the Trobriand Islands, to the east of New Guinea, the marriage of cross-cousins is fairly frequent and is considered distinctly desirable.[3]

Cross cousin marriage in the Trobriand Islands.

§ 9. *The Marriage of Cousins in Melanesia*

Cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia.

Among the Melanesians, the swarthy race of the Pacific, who inhabit the long chain of archipelagoes stretching from the Admiralty Islands on the north to New Caledonia on the south, and to Fiji on the east, the preference for marriage with a first cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, meets us in several islands far distant from each other. Thus, among the natives of New Caledonia, in the extreme south, first cousins who are the children of a

[1] C. G. Seligmann, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 508, quoting the Rev. J. T. Field.

[2] Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. (Cambridge, 1904) p. 239.

[3] Bronislaw Malinowski, "Baloma; the Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvi. (1916) p. 389 note 2.

The marriage of cross-cousins favoured and the marriage of ortho-cousins forbidden in New Caledonia.

brother and sister respectively are free to marry each other; indeed, such a relationship is thought to form a special reason why the cousins should wed. But, on the contrary, first cousins who are the children of two sisters or of two brothers are regarded as themselves brothers and sisters, and therefore they are forbidden to intermarry; more than that, they must avoid each other in ordinary life; they may not even look at each other, and if the two meet by chance, the girl will throw herself into the bushes or the water or anywhere else, to avoid her male cousin, and he will pass by without turning his head.[1]

The marriage of cross-cousins favoured and the marriage of ortho-cousins forbidden in Futuna, one of the New Hebrides.

In Futuna, one of the Southern New Hebrides, "male and female children of two or more brothers, or of two or more sisters, were, in native language, called *brothers* and *sisters*. It was, accordingly, against native law for them to intermarry. The children called their father's brothers 'father,' and the sisters of their mother they called 'mother'; while the so-called parents called the children 'my son' or 'my daughter.' This relationship—and consequently the prohibition to intermarry—extended even to the grand-children or great-grandchildren of brothers or sisters. . . . Male and female children of brothers and sisters were *cousins* and eligible by native law for marriage with each other. The children called the brothers of their mother 'uncle,' and the sisters of their father 'aunt,' as with us; while the uncle and aunt called the children 'my nephew' or 'my niece.' The cousins of opposite sex were betrothed from birth; and a male, while yet a child, called his female cousin 'my wife,' while she called him 'my husband.' If, however, the boy on growing up did not care for his betrothed, his friends sought him another wife. But no one could take his first betrothed without his sanction or without paying him for her in full."[2] Here the distinction drawn between

[1] Le Père Lambert, *Mœurs et Superstitions des Néo-Calédoniens* (Nouméa, 1900), pp. 114 *sq.*

[2] William Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna* (London, 1914), pp. 205 *sq.* But the writer adds, "There were exceptions to these general rules. For example, in Aneityum [another island of the Southern New Hebrides], one calls his father's sister 'mother,' not 'aunt.' In Erromanga the sons and daughters of a brother and sister are not 'cousins,' but 'brothers' and 'sisters,' in the same way as if they were the children of brothers or of sisters; and therefore marriage between those brothers and sisters was 'tapu,' or improper" (*op. cit.* pp. 206 *sq.*).

ortho-cousins (the children of brothers or the children of sisters) and cross-cousins (the children of a brother and of a sister respectively) is very marked: the former call each other "brother" and "sister," and may never marry, the latter call each other "husband" and "wife" and are betrothed to each other from birth.

The marriage of cross-cousins favoured and the marriage of ortho-cousins forbidden in Tanna, one of the New Hebrides.

In Tanna, a neighbouring island of the Southern New Hebrides, the custom is precisely similar: "the law of marriage is that the children of two brothers or two sisters do not marry; they are counted as brothers and sisters. But the children of brothers and sisters marry. The children are betrothed in infancy, and are expected to wed when grown up sufficiently."[1] In other words, a man may not marry his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother, for he regards such a cousin as his sister. But he may, and should marry his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister; for he regards such a cousin as his proper wife, and the two have been betrothed from infancy. In short, cross-cousins are expected to marry each other, and ortho-cousins are forbidden to do so.

In Hiw, one of the Torres Islands, marriage with a mother's brother's daughter appears to be particularly favoured; the father of the girl desires specially to have his nephew, the son of his sister, for his son-in-law, and if he gets him, he will not look for any payment from him. Thus, by wedding his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, a man gets a wife for nothing, which is naturally a strong inducement to marry in the family. Further, in this island a man may also marry his first cousin, the daughter of his father's sister; but curiously enough this marriage with his cousin seems to be regarded as a sort of imperfect substitute for marriage with his aunt, the girl's mother, custom or public opinion favouring the union of a nephew with his aunt, his father's sister, always provided that his venerable bride is not too aged and decrepit. Should she, however, be so far gone in the sere and yellow leaf that he is compelled reluctantly

In Hiw, one of the Torres Islands, marriage with the mother's brother's daughter is favoured, and marriage with the father's sister's daughter is allowed, as a substitute for marriage with the paternal aunt, the girl's mother.

[1] Rev. Wm. Gray, "Some notes on the Tannese," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Hobart, Tasmania, in January 1892* (Sydney), p. 677.

to relinquish her faded charms and wed her blooming daughter, he will thenceforth strictly avoid the old lady, his mother-in-law, whom he had refused to lead to the altar; he will not speak to her nor even come near her, although before his marriage with her daughter he had been under no such restrictions in his relations with the ancient dame. Similarly, if a man has married his other first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, custom requires that after the marriage he should adopt a like cold and distant demeanour, not to his mother-in-law, but to his father-in-law, his maternal uncle.

Cross-cousin marriage in Loh.

In Loh, another of the Torres Islands, marriage with the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, also takes place, though probably it is far less habitual than in Hiw. Moreover, in Loh such marriages are subject to certain restrictions. It is said that a man will only marry such a cousin if she has two elder sisters. In other words, if a man has only two daughters, they will not marry their cross-cousins; but if he has more than two daughters, the third daughter may marry either the son of her father's sister or the son of her mother's brother.[1]

In Fiji the marriage of ortho-cousins is forbidden, but cross-cousins are regarded as each other's proper mates.

In Fiji the distinction between cross-cousins (the children of a brother and of a sister respectively) and ortho-cousins (the children of two brothers or of two sisters) is very sharply marked; and whereas ortho-cousins are regarded as brothers and sisters, and are therefore not marriageable with each other, cross-cousins are not only marriageable with each other, but are regarded as each other's proper mates. Accordingly, the two classes of cousins, which we confound under that general name, are distinguished among the Fijians by epithets signifying that the one class (cross-cousins) is marriageable, and that the other class (ortho-cousins) is not marriageable. The epithet applied to cross-cousins is *veindavolani*, which means "marriageable," literally "concubitants"; the epithet applied to ortho-cousins is *veinganeni*, which means "not marriageable," literally "those who shun each other."[2] "The

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1914), i. 184 *sq.*

[2] L. Fison and Basil H. Thomson, "The Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) pp. 360 *sq.*, 371-373; Basil Thomson, *The Fijians* (London, 1908), pp. 182 *sqq.* Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 141 *sqq.*

young Fijian is from his birth regarded as the natural husband of the daughters of his father's sister and of his mother's brother. The girls can exercise no choice. They were born the property of their male concubitant if he desire to take them."[1] Cross-cousins, called *veindavolani*, or "concubitants," "are born husband and wife, and the system assumes that no individual preference could hereafter destroy that relationship; but the obligation does no more than limit the choice of a mate to one or the other of the females who are concubitants with the man who desires to marry. It is thus true that in theory the field of choice is very large, for the concubitant relationship might include third or even fifth cousins, but in practice the tendency is to marry the concubitant who is next in degree—generally a first cousin—the daughter of a maternal uncle."[2] This last statement seems to imply that, while a man is free to marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister, marriage with the mother's brother's daughter is generally preferred.

In Fiji a man is not only forbidden to marry, but is bound to shun his ortho-cousins.

But whereas a Fijian has thus the right, if not the obligation, to marry any of his cross-cousins, the daughters either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, all of whom he calls his "concubitants," he regards his ortho-cousins, the daughters either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother, as his sisters, and as such he is bound to shun every one of them as scrupulously as if she were in truth his very sister, the daughter of his own father and mother. "He will *nganena* (avoid) her as carefully as if she were the daughter of his own mother. If she enter a house in which he is sitting with his legs extended, he will draw up his feet and look away from her. If he meets her in the path he will ignore her existence. It would be indecent for him to be alone with her, to touch her, or even to speak to her. If he must speak of her, he will not use the term of relationship between them; he will not say 'my *ngane*' (my sister)—he will refer to her as 'one of my kinsfolk.'

[1] Basil H. Thomson, "Concubitancy in the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 373: *id.*, *The Fijians*, p. 184.

[2] Basil Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 186 *sq.*; *id.*, "Concubitancy in the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 375.

In short, he makes no distinction between her and his own sister, the daughter of his own father and mother."[1] It would hardly be possible to draw the line of demarcation between cross-cousins and ortho-cousins more broadly and deeply than it is drawn in Fiji.

But in some parts of Fiji there is a tendency to discountenance the marriage of cross-cousins.

But if cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, are generally regarded in Fiji as the proper mates for each other, "in Lau, Thakaundrove, and in the greater portion of Vanualevu, the offspring of a brother and sister respectively do not become concubitant until the second generation. In the first generation they are called tabu, but marriage is not actually prohibited."[2] Thus in these parts of Fiji there appears to be a growing aversion to the marriage of first cousins, and a tendency, not yet fully developed, to forbid such unions and only to permit of marriage between second or still more remote cousins. In some Australian tribes, as we shall see presently, this tendency has been carried out to its logical conclusion by prohibiting all marriages of first cousins and even devising a special and somewhat cumbrous piece of social machinery for the purpose of preventing them.

All marriages of first cousins forbidden in the Banks' Islands.

In parts of Melanesia itself the aversion to cousin marriages has been carried to the pitch of prohibiting them all indiscriminately. Thus, in the Banks' Islands cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, are forbidden by custom to marry each other, because they are considered to be too nearly related by blood; if they married, they would be said to "go wrong."[3] And as in these islands a man is debarred from marrying his ortho-cousins, the daughters of his mother's sister or of his father's brother because, in virtue of the bisection of the community into two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the maternal line, all these female cousins belong to the same

[1] Lorimer Fison, "The Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 363. Mr. Fison is here speaking of second cousins, but the rule would apply *a fortiori* to first cousins who are *veinganeni* (not marriageable) to each other.

[2] Basil Thomson, *The Fijians*, pp. 190 *sq.*; *id.*, "Concubitancy in the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 379.

[3] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (Oxford, 1891), pp. 29. Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 75 *sq.*

exogamous class as himself,[1] it follows that in the Banks' Islands no man may marry his first cousin, whether she be his mother's brother's daughter, his father's sister's daughter, his mother's sister's daughter, or his father's brother's daughter. In short, all marriages between first cousins without distinction are barred.

All marriages of first cousins forbidden in New Ireland.

In the central districts of New Ireland, one of the largest of the Melanesian islands, the rules which forbid the marriage of all first cousins are exactly similar to those which prevail in the Banks' Islands. There, too, the community is divided into two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the maternal line. This of itself suffices to exclude the marriage of all ortho-cousins, the children either of two sisters or of two brothers, since it ensures that all such cousins belong to the same exogamous class and are therefore forbidden to marry each other, in virtue of the law of exogamy which prohibits all matrimonial unions between persons of the same class. But, on the other hand, cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, necessarily belong to different exogamous classes, and are therefore so far marriageable. Yet custom forbids such cousins to marry each other; more than that, just as among the Baganda,[2] such cousins are bound scrupulously to avoid each other in the ordinary intercourse of daily life; they may not approach each other, they may not shake hands or even touch each other, they may not give each other presents, they may not mention each other's names. But they are allowed to speak to each other at a distance of several paces.[3] Here, as elsewhere, these rules of mutual avoidance observed between persons of the opposite sex are clearly precautions to prevent them from entering into sexual relations which are condemned by public opinion, though they are not barred by the law of exogamy.

Mutual avoidance of cross-cousins in New Ireland.

[1] As to exogamy in these islands see R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians*, pp. 21 *sqq.*; *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 67 *sqq.*

[2] See above, pp. 160 *sq.*

[3] P. G. Peckel, "Die Verwantschaftsnamen des mittleren Neumecklenburg," *Anthropos*, iii. (1908) pp. 467, 470 *sq.* Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 127 *sq.*

§ 10. *The Marriage of Cousins in Polynesia*

The marriage of cousins generally discountenanced in Polynesia.

While the custom of marriage with a first cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, is permitted and even favoured in some parts of Melanesia, though forbidden in others, it seems to have found little or no favour among the Polynesians, who, akin to the Melanesians in language and perhaps in blood, occupy the numerous small islands scattered broadcast over the Pacific to the east of Melanesia, together with the large islands of New Zealand to the south. On this subject, Mr. Basil Thomson, who has carefully investigated the custom of cousin marriage in Fiji, reports as follows: "Inquiries that have been made among the natives of Samoa, Futuna, Rotuma, Uea, and Malanta (Solomon Group),[1] have satisfied me that the practice of concubitant marriage is unknown in those islands; indeed, in Samoa and Rotuma, not only is the marriage of cousins-german forbidden, but the descendants of a brother and sister respectively, who in Fiji would be expected to marry, are there regarded as being within the forbidden degrees as long as their common origin can be remembered. This rule is also recognised throughout the Gilbert Islands, with the exception of Apemama and Makin, and is there only violated by the high chiefs. In Tonga, it is true, a trace of the custom can be detected. The union of the grandchildren (and occasionally even of the children) of a brother and sister is there regarded as a fit and proper custom for the superior chiefs, but not for the common people. In Tonga, other things being equal, a sister's children rank above a brother's, and therefore the concubitant rights were vested in the sister's grandchild, more especially if a female. Her parents might send for her male cousin to be her *takaifala* (*lit.*, 'bedmaker') or consort. The practice was never, however, sufficiently general to be called a national custom. So startling a variation from the practice of the other Polynesian races may be accounted for by the suggestion that the chiefs, more autocratic in Tonga than elsewhere, having founded

Trace of the custom of cross-cousin marriage in Tonga.

[1] Of these islands, Futuna and Malanta belong to Melanesia; the rest are Polynesian.

their authority upon the fiction of their descent from the gods, were driven to keep it by intermarriage among themselves, lest in contaminating their blood by alliance with their subjects their divine rights should be impaired. A similar infringement of forbidden degrees by chiefs has been noted in Hawaii, where the chief of Mau'i was, for reasons of state, required to marry his half-sister. It is matter of common knowledge that for the same reason the Incas of Peru married their full-sister, and that the kings of Siam marry their half-sisters at the present day." [1]

Second cousins, the grandchildren of a brother and sister, allowed to marry in Rotuma.

The testimony of other well-informed writers confirms the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Basil Thomson. Thus in regard to Rotuma we are told by Professor J. Stanley Gardiner that "a grandchild of a man and wife might marry his or her *hoisasiga*, second cousin, if he or she was descended from the *seghoni*, the man's sister, or the *segvevene*, the woman's brother, but not, it was distinctly stated, if the descent was from the man's brother or the woman's sister, both of which relationships are expressed by the term *sosoghi*. The same terms I understand to have been used of first cousins to one another, in accordance with the relationships of their parents." [2] In other words, second cousins were allowed to marry each other, if they were the grandchildren of a brother and a sister respectively, but not if they were the grandchildren of two brothers or of two sisters. Nothing is expressly said as to the marriage of first cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters; but as we are told that even second cousins, the children of such first cousins, are forbidden to intermarry, we may safely assume, that the same prohibition applies *a fortiori* to their parents, the first cousins.

The marriage even of distant cousins rare in Mangaia.

Again, with regard to the natives of Mangaia, one of the Hervey Islands, we are informed by the Rev. W. Wyatt Gill, who knows these people intimately, that among them "distant cousins sometimes (though rarely) marry; but must be of the same generation, *i.e.* descended in the same degree (fourth or fifth or even more remotely) from the

[1] Basil Thomson, *The Fijians* (London, 1908), p. 191; *id.*, "Concubitancy in the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 379.

[2] J. Stanley Gardiner, "The Natives of Rotuma," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxvii. (1898) p. 478.

common ancestor. That the male branch should thus invade the female is a far more pardonable offence than the converse, but even then, should misfortune or disease overtake these related couples, the elders of the tribe would declare it to be the anger of the clan-god."[1] What the writer here means by the male branch invading the female, or the female branch invading the male, is far from clear; perhaps the meaning may be that when, let us say, third cousins, the great-grandchildren of a brother and sister respectively, marry each other, it is more usual for a great-grandson of the brother to marry a great-granddaughter of the sister, than for a great-grandson of the sister to marry a great-granddaughter of the brother. Be that as it may, we may infer from Mr. Gill's statement that in Mangaia first cousins never marry each other; that even remote cousins, such as fourth or fifth, rarely do so; and that a cousin never marries a cousin who is in a different generation from his own, reckoning their descent from their common ancestors; for example, a third cousin might not marry his third cousin once removed, though he might marry his third cousin herself. We have found the same objection to overstepping the limit of a generation in cousin marriages among the Toradjas of Central Celebes,[2] and the Mafulus of New Guinea.[3]

§ 11. *The Marriage of Cousins in Australia*

In Australia some tribes prefer the marriage of certain cousins to any other marriage; other tribes prohibit all marriages between cousins.

Among the aborigines of Australia, the lowest savages as to whose social organization we possess comparatively full and accurate information, we find the same striking contrast in regard to cousin marriages which has met us in other races; for while in some Australian tribes the marriage of certain cousins is preferred to all other marriages, in others on the contrary all marriages of cousins without exception are prohibited, and an elaborate social machinery has been devised apparently for the express purpose of barring those very forms of cousin marriage which other tribes regard as the most desirable of all matrimonial unions. An examina-

[1] Rev. W. Wyatt Gill, "Mangaia (Hervey Islands)," *Report of the Second Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Melbourne, Victoria, in January 1890* (Sydney), p. 330.

[2] See above, pp. 169 *sq.*

[3] See above, p. 176.

tion of the Australian practice in this respect is particularly important and instructive, because, occupying the lowest rung on the social ladder, the Australian aborigines appear to retain more completely than elsewhere those primitive usages out of which the widespread custom of cousin marriage has been evolved, but which in more advanced communities have been partially or wholly obliterated by the progress of civilization.

In the Urabunna tribe of Central Australia a man is expected to marry his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's elder brother or of his father's elder sister.

Among the Urabunna, a tribe of Central Australia who are divided into two exogamous classes with descent of the class from the mother, not from the father, to the children, a man's proper wife is always one of those women whom we should call his first cousins, being the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister. In other words, he is expected and enjoined to marry one of his cross-cousins. On the other hand, he is strictly forbidden to marry certain other first cousins, whom I have called ortho-cousins, namely, the daughter of his mother's sister and the daughter of his father's brother; and the reason why both these cousins are prohibited to him is that they belong to the same exogamous class as himself, and are therefore barred to him by the fundamental law which forbids a man to marry a woman of his own exogamous class. But even among his cross-cousins, the daughters either of his mother's brothers or of his father's sisters, the choice of an Urabunna man is not unlimited; for he may only take to wife a daughter of his mother's *elder* brother or a daughter of his father's *elder* sister; the daughters of his mother's *younger* brothers and the daughters of his father's *younger* sisters are forbidden to him in marriage. Thus a man's wife must always belong to the senior side of the house, so far as he is concerned; and a woman's husband must always belong to the junior side of the house, so far as she is concerned.[1] This is the first time that such a limitation of choice between cross-cousins has met us in our survey of cousin marriage; an explanation of it will be suggested later on.[2]

Again, among the Ya-itma-thang and the Ngarigo, two tribes on the borders of Victoria and New South Wales,

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), pp. 61-65; *id.*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), pp. 73 *sq.*; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 177 *sqq.*

[2] Below, pp. 337 *sq.*

Cross-cousin marriage in tribes of Victoria and New South Wales.

who, like the Urabunna, were divided into two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the maternal line, a man's proper wife was his cross-cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother;[1] but he might not marry any of his ortho-cousins, the daughters either of his mother's sisters or of his father's brothers, because they belonged to the same exogamous class as himself, and were therefore barred to him by the fundamental law which forbade a man to marry a woman of his own exogamous class.[2] Among the Yuin, a tribe on the southern coast of New South Wales, who traced descent in the male line, a man was free to marry the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister; but we are not told that, as among the Urabunna, he was expected to do so.[3] Again, among the Wolgal, a tribe which inhabited the tablelands of the highest Australian Alps, a man's proper wife was the daughter of his mother's brother. The rule was the same in the Omeo tribe.[4]

Cross-cousin marriage among the Kabi of Queensland and the Kariera of North-Western Australia.

In the Kabi tribe of South-Eastern Queensland, who were divided into four exogamous classes, a man might marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister; but apparently marriage with the former was preferred.[5] Again, in the Kariera tribe of North-Western Australia, who are divided into four exogamous classes, "a man may marry the daughter of his own mother's brother, or of his own father's sister. Such marriages of the children of a brother with those of his sister are common in this tribe. Indeed we may say that the proper person for a man to marry, if it be possible, is his own first cousin. In the genealogies collected by me I found that in nearly every case where such a marriage was possible, it had taken place. . . . Consequently the woman who is pre-eminently a man's *ñuba*[6] is the daughter of his own mother's brother, or

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), pp. 77, 101, 196, 197, 198; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 392 *sq.*

[2] This prohibition of marriage with ortho-cousins in the Ya-itma-thang tribe is not expressly mentioned by Dr. Howitt (*llcc.*), but it follows necessarily from the organization of the tribe in two exogamous classes.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 262, "Marriage was permitted between the father's sister's child and the mother's brother's child"; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 491.

[4] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 197; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 395.

[5] John Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland* (London and Leipsic, 1910), pp. 156 *sq.*

[6] Potential wife.

failing this, of his own father's sister. It is this woman to whom he has the first right as a wife."[1] But in this tribe on the other hand a man is, as usual, prohibited from marrying his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother,[2] because all such cousins belong to the same exogamous class as himself and are therefore barred to him by the law of exogamy. In short, among the Kariera a man ought to marry his cross-cousin, but he may not marry his ortho-cousin.

Cross-cousin marriage in the East Pilbara district of North-Western Australia.

Again, with regard to the tribes of the East Pilbara district, in North-Western Australia, who are also divided into four exogamous classes, we are told that "cross-cousin (first cousin) marriages are permitted in the above tribes, own mother's brothers' sons and own father's sisters' daughters being betrothed to each other."[3] Strictly speaking, this statement only implies that one form of cross-cousin marriage is permitted, namely, that in which a man marries the daughter of his father's sister. But we may conjecture that the writer intended to include the other form of cross-cousin marriage also, namely that in which a man marries the daughter of his mother's brother; for it would be contrary to all Australian analogy to find in the same tribe the first of these marriages permitted and the second barred.

The Dieri of Central Australia forbade cross-cousins to marry, but allowed the children of cross-cousins to marry in certain cases.

But while the marriage of certain cousins is permitted or even preferred in some Australian tribes, it is absolutely prohibited in others. For example, among the Dieri, a tribe of Central Australia, who were divided into two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the maternal line, cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, were expressly forbidden to marry each other, although the

[1] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 155 *sq.*

[2] E. Clement, "Ethnographical Notes on the Western Australian aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi. (1904) p. 12. One of the tribes here described by Mr. Clement is what he calls the Kaierra, which seems to be identical with the Kariera described by Mr. A. R. Brown, The permission given to cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister, to marry each other, is mentioned by Mr. Clement (*l.c.*), but he does not indicate that decided preference for such marriages which is recorded by Mr. A. R. Brown.

[3] Mrs. D. M. Bates, "Social organization of some Western Australian tribes," *Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Melbourne, 1913* (Melbourne, 1914), p. 391.

rule of class exogamy interposed no barrier to their union. But the children of such first cousins were permitted, at least in certain cases, to marry each other; indeed they were regarded as each other's proper mates. Thus among the Dieri a man might not marry his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister; but he was free to marry his second cousin, in the cases in which she was his mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter, or his mother's father's sister's daughter's daughter; indeed such second cousins were the proper mates for each other. In other words, husband and wife should always be second cousins, descended through their mothers from a brother and a sister respectively.[1] This rule of marriage presents a remarkable contrast to the rule observed by the Urabunna, the neighbours of the Dieri on the north-west; and the contrast is all the more striking because the social organization of the two tribes is similar, consisting of two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the maternal line. Yet with this similarity of social organization the two neighbouring tribes observe quite different rules with regard to the marriage of cousins; for whereas the Urabunna permit or rather enjoin the marriage of cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, the Dieri positively forbid the marriage of such first cousins, and only permit or rather enjoin, marriage between their children, that is, between second cousins in the particular case in which the two are both descended through their mothers from a brother and a sister. We cannot doubt that of the two customs, the one which forbids the marriage of first cousins is later than the one which permits or rather enjoins it; for an attentive examination of the marriage systems of the Australian aborigines points unmistakeably to the conclusion that among these tribes there has been a steady tendency to extend the list of forbidden degrees, in other words, to prevent more and more the marriage of near blood relations. Of this tendency the contrast between the usages of the two neighbouring tribes, the Urabunna and the Dieri, furnishes a conspicuous example; for here we have

Remarkable contrast between the customs of the Dieri and the Urabunna in regard to the marriage of cross-cousins.

[1] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 164 *sq.*, 189; *id.*, in *Folk-lore*, xviii. (1907) pp. 172 *sqq.* Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 346.

two tribes living side by side under precisely similar circumstances and under precisely similar social organizations; yet the one enjoins the marriage of certain cousins, and the other positively forbids it. Of the two tribes, therefore, we may say without hesitation that the Dieri, who forbid the marriage, stand one rung higher up the social ladder than the Urabunna, who enjoin it.[1]

The marriage of ortho-cousins always barred in tribes with two exogamous classes.

When we speak of the express permission or the express prohibition of cousin marriage in these two tribes, the reader must always bear in mind that the marriage in question is that between cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively. The marriage between ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, is barred by the system of exogamous classes, since these cousins necessarily belong to the same exogamous class and are therefore not marriageable with each other; consequently no special prohibition is required to prevent their union. The regular machinery of the social system suffices to keep them apart.

Among the Mardudhunera of North-Western Australia, the rules in regard to the marriage of cross-cousins are the same as among the Dieri.

Among the Mardudhunera of North-Western Australia, who are divided into four exogamous classes, the rule as to the marriage of cousins agrees exactly with that of the Dieri; for among them also a man is bound to marry his second cousin, in the particular cases in which she is either his mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter, or his mother's father's sister's daughter's daughter; indeed he is not allowed to marry any woman who does not stand in one of these relations to him. But of the two relations it would seem as if the mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter were preferred to the mother's father's sister's daughter's daughter. In short, among the Mardudhunera, just as among the Dieri, husband and wife should always be second cousins, descended through their mothers from a brother and a sister respectively. Such second cousins are betrothed to each other in infancy, or rather before they were born, the match having been arranged in the families before the birth or even the conception of the infants.[2]

[1] This was the opinion of Dr. A. W. Howitt, who says, "The Dieri rule is evidently a development of that of the Urabunna, and is therefore the later one" (*The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 189). Compare his observations in *Folk-lore*, xviii. (1907) pp. 173 *sq.*

[2] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the*

The marriage of all cousins forbidden in some Australian tribes.

The Wotjobaluk tribe of Victoria, whose class system was anomalous, carried the objection to cousin marriage still further than the Dieri and the Mardudhunera; for not only did they strictly forbid cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, to marry each other, but they forbade the descendants of these cousins, so far as the relationship could be traced, to unite in marriage; in short, they prohibited the marriage of all cousins, both near and distant. On this prohibition they laid great stress, saying that such persons "could not mix their flesh, because their flesh (*yauerin*) was too near."[1] Again, in the Kulin tribes of Victoria, which were divided into two exogamous classes with descent of the class in the paternal line, "marriages not only between the children of two brothers, or of two sisters, but also between those of a brother on one side and of a sister on the other side, were absolutely prohibited, it being held that they were too near to each other."[2] The Bangerang, a tribe at the junction of the Goulburn and Murray Rivers, who were divided into two exogamous classes with paternal descent of the class, went still further; for among them "not only was it forbidden to the children of a brother on the one side, and a sister on the other, to marry, but their descendants, as far as they could be reckoned, were equally debarred. It was held that they were 'too near,' and only a little removed from 'brother and sister.'"[3] The Narrinyeri, a tribe of South Australia, who were divided into exogamous totem clans with paternal descent of the totem, were equally scrupulous with regard to the marriage of near kin. Of them

---

Royal Anthropological Institute, xliii. (1913) pp. 184 *sq.* After mentioning a man's marriage with his mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter, Mr. Brown adds (p. 184), "He may not marry any woman who does not bear this relation to him." Yet he goes on to say (p. 185) that a man, A, and his wife may ask the woman's father's sister to promise her daughter to be the wife's mother of the man A's still unborn son. In this latter case, when the children are born and marry, the man's wife is his mother's father's sister's daughter's daughter. From this I infer that, while the latter relationship (mother's father's sister's daughter's daughter) is allowed, the former relationship (mother's mother's brother's daughter's daughter) is preferred.

[1] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 241, 243. *Yauerin* means flesh, but is also applied to the exogamous class and to the totem (Howitt, *op. cit.* p. 241).

[2] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 254.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 257.

we are told by an observer who knew them intimately that "the aversion of the natives to even second cousins marrying is very great. They are extremely strict in this matter. The first inquiry with regard to a proposed marriage is, whether there is any tie of kindred between the parties, and if there be it prevents the match, and if the couple should cohabit afterwards they will be always looked upon with dishonour." [1] Again, throughout North-Western Queensland generally, "a man cannot marry his father's sister's daughter, his mother's brother's daughter, or his daughter's daughter, while a woman must carnally avoid her mother's brother's son, her father's sister's son, or her son's son, etc., notwithstanding the fact that these particular relationships are necessarily located in the same exogamous groups which otherwise would be allowed to join in permanent sexual partnership." [2]

Thus among the aboriginal tribes of Australia there is a difference of opinion and of practice in regard to the marriage of cousins.

Thus, while some Australian tribes prefer the marriage of cross-cousins to any other form of matrimonial union, many others disapprove of and forbid it. Indeed so widespread is this disapprobation of cousin marriage in aboriginal Australia, that Mr. E. M. Curr, who did much for the study of the Australian natives, could even affirm in general that among them "the union of blood-relations is forbidden, and held in abhorrence; so that a man may not marry his mother, sister, half-sister, daughter, grand-daughter, aunt, niece, first or second cousin." [3] But in the light of some of the foregoing facts this statement is seen to be an exaggeration.

§ 12. *Why is the Marriage of Cross-Cousins favoured?*

Why is the marriage of cross-cousins so generally favoured? Why is the marriage of orthocousins so generally forbidden?

We have now traced the practice of cousin marriage through a considerable part of the lower races of mankind and found it in full vogue among some of the aboriginal tribes of Australia, who rank at or near the bottom of the social scale. But we have still to ask, Why is the marriage

[1] Rev. Geo. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in J. D. Woods' *Native Tribes of South Australia* (Adelaide, 1879), p. 12.

[2] Walter E. Roth, "Marriage Ceremonies and Infant Life," *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10* (1908), p. 2. Compare *id.*, *Ethnological Studies of the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines* (Brisbane and London, 1897), p. 182.

[3] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (Melbourne and London, 1886–1887), i. 106.

The preference for cross-cousin marriage to be first considered.

of cross-cousins so often favoured? Why is the marriage of ortho-cousins so uniformly prohibited? The comparatively primitive condition of society in aboriginal Australia holds out a hope that there, if anywhere, we may detect the motives which first led men to favour the one form of marriage and to forbid the other. It will be convenient to consider the two questions separately. We shall begin with the question, Why is the marriage of cross-cousins so often favoured?

In aboriginal Australia the primary motive for the preference of cousin marriage appears to be an economic one. On account of the extreme poverty of the Australian aborigines a wife is among them a man's most valuable possession.

In aboriginal Australia the primary motive which led to a preference for cousin marriage appears to have been an economic one. We must bear in mind that the Australian savages neither till the ground nor rear cattle; that for the most part they possess no permanent abode, but roam over the country in search of the wild animals and wild plants on which they subsist; and that they own hardly any personal property except a few simple tools and weapons, rudely fashioned out of wood and stone, for in their natural state they are totally ignorant of the metals. Among people living in this primitive fashion a man's most valuable possession is his wife; for not only does she bear him children, who help him and are a source of gain to him in various ways, but she also does most of the hard work for him, carrying the baggage as well as the infants on the march, constructing the temporary shelter of branches in which they pass the night, collecting firewood, fetching water, and procuring the whole of the vegetable food of the family; for it is the woman's business to dig the roots and gather the seeds and fruits which furnish these wandering savages with a great, sometimes perhaps the greater, part of their means of subsistence. "After marriage," says a writer who knew the Australian aborigines well in the old days, "the women are compelled to do all the hard work of erecting habitations, collecting fuel and water, carrying burdens, procuring roots and delicacies of various kinds, making baskets for cooking roots and other purposes, preparing food, and attending to the children. The only work the men do, in time of peace, is to hunt for opossums and large animals of various kinds, and to make rugs and weapons."[1] Accord-

[1] James Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide, 1881), pp. 36 *sq.* See further W. E. Stanbridge, "Tribes in the Central

ingly we are told that "as the women perform all the labour, they are the most important part of the property of an Australian native, who is rich in proportion to the number of wives he possesses." [1]

Having no equivalent in property to give for a wife, an Australian aboriginal is generally obliged to get her in exchange for a female relative, usually a sister or daughter.

How then does an Australian native procure that most valuable of all his possessions, his wife? He cannot, like people at a somewhat higher stage of social evolution, purchase her from her parents by giving them an equivalent in property of some kind, whether it be goods, or cattle, or money. Accordingly he is generally reduced to bartering one woman for another; in order to get a wife for himself or his son, he is compelled to give a daughter, a sister, or some other female relative to the man from whom he obtains his bride or his daughter-in-law. The voluntary interchange of women, especially of daughters or of sisters, appears to be the ordinary way of supplying the demand for wives in the matrimonial market of aboriginal Australia. "It may be safely laid down as a broad and general proposition," says the late Dr. A. W. Howitt, one of our best authorities on the natives of Australia, "that among these savages a wife was obtained by the exchange of a female relative, with the alternative possibility of obtaining one by inheritance (*Levirate*), by elopement, or by capture. . . . It seems to me that the most common practice is the exchange of girls by their respective parents as wives for each other's sons, or in some tribes the exchange of sisters, or of some female relatives by the young men themselves." [2] Again, we are told that "the Australian male almost invariably obtains his wife or wives, either as the survivor of a married brother, or in exchange for his sisters, or later on in life for his daughters. Occasionally also an aged widow whom the rightful heir does not claim is taken possession of by some bachelor; but for

Part of Victoria," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, New Series, i. (1861) pp. 290 *sq.*; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria* (Melbourne and London, 1881), i. 85; E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (Melbourne and London, 1886–1887), i. 99; C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (London, 1889), pp. 160; and the copious evidence collected by B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (London, 1913), pp. 275 *sqq.*

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 162.

[2] A. W. Howitt, "On the Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, 1889, pp. 115, 116.

the most part those who have no female relatives to give in exchange have to go without wives."[1] "It is not uncommon for an Australian to inherit a wife; the custom being that a widow falls to the lot of the brother of the deceased husband. But the commonest way of getting a wife is by giving a sister or a daughter in exchange."[2]

Wives procured in exchange for sisters or daughters among the tribes of South Australia.

In the Encounter Bay tribe of South Australia, the marriage ceremony "is very simple, and with great propriety may be considered an exchange, for no man can obtain a wife unless he can promise to give his sister or other relative in exchange. . . . Should the father be living he may give his daughter away, but generally she is the gift of the brother."[3] In this tribe, "if a man has several girls at his disposal, he speedily obtains several wives, who, however, very seldom agree well with each other, but are continually quarrelling, each endeavouring to be the favourite. The man, regarding them more as slaves than in any other light, employs them in every possible way to his own advantage. They are obliged to get him shell-fish, roots, and eatable plants. If one from another tribe should arrive having anything which he desires to purchase, he perhaps makes a bargain to pay by letting him have one of his wives for a longer or shorter period."[4] Among the Narrinyeri, another tribe of South Australia, "it is regarded by the females as very disgraceful not to be *given away* in exchange for another. A young woman who goes away with a man and lives with him as his wife without the consent of her relatives is regarded as very little better than a prostitute. She is always open to the taunt that she had nothing given for her. When a man has a sister or daughter whom it is his right to give away, he will often sell that right to a man who wants a wife for either money, clothes, or weapons, and then the purchaser will give the woman away in exchange for a wife for himself."[5] However, in this tribe "in most instances

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (Melbourne and London, 1886–1887), i. 107.

[2] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 164.

[3] H. E. A. Meyer, "Manners and Customs of the Aborigines of the Encounter Bay Tribe," in J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (Adelaide, 1879), p. 190.

[4] H. E. A. Meyer, *op. cit.* p. 191.

[5] Rev. George Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia*, pp. 11 *sq.*

a brother or first cousin gives a girl away in exchange for a wife for himself."[1]

Among the tribes which occupy, or rather used to occupy, the great flat lands of the Lower Murray, Lower Lachlan, and Lower Darling Rivers in Victoria and New South Wales, "polygamy is allowed to any extent, and this law is generally taken advantage of by those who chance to be rich in sisters, daughters, or female wards, to give in exchange for wives. No man can get a wife unless he has a sister, ward, or daughter, whom he can give in exchange. Fathers of grown-up sons frequently exchange their daughters for wives, not for their sons, however, but for themselves, even although they already have two or three. Cases of this kind are indeed very hard for the sons, but being aboriginal law they must bear it as best they can, and that too without murmur; and to make the matter harder still to bear, the elders of a tribe will not allow the young men to go off to other tribes to steal wives for themselves, as such measures would be the certain means of entailing endless feuds with their accompanying bloodshed, in the attempts that would surely be made with the view of recovering the abducted women. Young men, therefore, not having any female relatives or wards under their control must, as a consequence of the aboriginal law on the subject, live all their lives in single blessedness, unless they choose to take up with some withered old hags whom nobody owns, merely for the purpose of having their fires cared for, their water-vessels filled, and their baggage carried from camp to camp."[2] To the same effect another writer observes that "a man who has no female relations that can be exchanged for a young woman of another tribe leads an unhappy life. Not only must he attend to his own wants, and share the discomforts of the bachelors' quarters, but he is an object of suspicion to the older men, who have perhaps two or three young wives to watch. There is the fear also that he may violently seize a girl of a neighbouring tribe, and thus provoke a war. There

Wives procured in exchange for sisters or daughters among the tribes of Victoria and New South Wales.

[1] Rev. George Taplin, in E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, ii. 245.

[2] P. Beveridge, "Of the Aborigines inhabiting the Great Lacustrine and Riverine Depression of the Lower Murray, Lower Murrumbidgee, Lower Lachlan, and Lower Darling," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xvii. (1883) p. 23.

is the discontent and unrest of such a life, which makes him a dull companion, a quarrelsome friend, and a bitter enemy. Sometimes a wife is given to him by some old man who is tired of keeping her; but most often a warrior will steal a woman from another tribe, if he cannot inspire an affection and lead her to elope with him. Any such act brings about a conflict. As soon as the girl is missed, a search is instituted, and the guilty pair are invariably tracked to their hiding-place. When the discovery is made, the tribe to which the man belongs is informed of it, and there is a gathering of the old men of both tribes, and much talk and wrangling follows; but the main questions to be decided are these: Can a girl of the man's tribe be given in exchange for the woman that has been stolen? Is the man's tribe willing that the thief shall stand a form of trial somewhat resembling the ordeal of the ancient rude nations of Europe? If the first question is not settled satisfactorily by some generous creature offering a female relative in exchange, the second question is debated, but always on the understanding that the solemn obligation cannot be avoided."[1]

Since among the Australian aborigines women had a high economic and commercial value, a man who had many sisters or daughters was rich, and a man who had none was poor and might be unable to procure a wife at all.

Thus it appears that among the Australian aborigines a woman is prized not merely as a breeder of children, a nurse, a labourer, and a porter, but also as an article of barter; for in this last capacity she possesses a high commercial value, being exchangeable, either temporarily or permanently, for another woman or for other valuable commodities such as rugs and boomerangs. Hence a man who is rich in daughters or sisters is rich indeed. In truth, among these savages the female sex answers in some measure the purpose of a medium of exchange; they are the nearest native representative of the coin of the realm. So a man who has no daughters, sisters, or other exchangeable females at his command, is reduced to the lowest depth of penury; and if he would supply his deficiency, he can as a rule only do so by fraud or violence, in other words, either by inducing somebody else's wife, sister, or daughter to elope with him, or by forcibly carrying off a woman from a neighbouring tribe. Like a rogue elephant, banned from female society, he puts himself outside the pale of the law; he becomes a

[1] R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 79.

criminal and a robber, and as such he is punished by the persons he has wronged, whether they be of his own or of a neighbouring tribe, unless indeed some generous man, who has a superfluity of wives, consents to sacrifice one of them to meet the demands of justice. Hence it seems probable that the rape of women from neighbouring tribes, which some writers have apparently regarded as the normal way of obtaining a wife in aboriginal Australia, was in fact an exceptional proceeding, a crime committed for the most part by poor and desperate bachelors, who, having no sisters to barter, were compelled to resort to this irregular mode of procuring a consort. But such rapes were condemned and punished even by the members of the criminal's own tribe, because they were likely to embroil them in war with their neighbours. "On rare occasions," says Mr. E. M. Curr, "a wife is captured from another tribe, and carried off. There are strong reasons for believing, that when the continent was only partially occupied, elopements from within the tribe were frequent, and that those who eloped proceeded into the unpeopled wilds, and there established themselves. I have no doubt the Darling Blacks and the Narrinyeri owe their origin to proceedings of this sort, and also the Bangerang tribes. At present, as the stealing of a woman from a neighbouring tribe would involve the whole tribe of the thief in war for his sole benefit, and as the possession of the woman would lead to constant attacks, tribes set themselves very generally against the practice. As a consequence, women surprised by strange Blacks are always abused and often massacred; for murder may be atoned for, but unauthorized possession cannot be acquiesced in. Within the tribe, lovers occasionally abscond to some corner of the tribal territory, but they are soon overtaken, and the female cruelly beaten, or wounded with a spear, the man in most tribes remaining unpunished. Very seldom are men allowed to retain as wives their partners in these escapades."[1] "Marriage by capture," say Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, "is again, at the present day, whatever it may have been in the past, by no means the rule in Australian tribes, and too much stress has been laid upon this method. It is only comparatively rarely

The rape of women from other tribes was comparatively rare and was discountenanced because of its tendency to embroil the tribes in war.

[1] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 108.

that a native goes and seizes upon some *lubra* in a neighbouring tribe; by far the most common method of getting a wife is by means of an arrangement made between brothers or fathers of the respective men and women, whereby a particular woman is assigned to a particular man. Marriage by capture may indeed be regarded as one of the most exceptional methods of obtaining a wife amongst the natives at the present day."[1]

The practice of elopement within a tribe was not uncommon among the Australian aborigines.

On the other hand, the practice of elopement within the tribe, as distinguished from capture from without the tribe, would seem to have been fairly common, and to have been due to the difficulty which some young men had in obtaining wives by the normal and legal methods of betrothal or exchange. Marriage by elopement, according to Dr. A. W. Howitt, "obtains in all tribes in which infant betrothal occurs, and where the young men, or some of them, find more or less difficulty through this practice, or by there being no female relative available for exchange, or indeed wherever a couple fall in love with each other and cannot obtain consent to their marriage. Marriage by elopement occurs so frequently, that although it is always regarded as a breach of the law and custom, yet, as it is under certain circumstances a valid union, it may be considered a recognised form of marriage."[2]

Among the Australian aborigines the old men availed themselves of the system of exchange in order to procure a number

The scarcity of women available as wives for young men was caused in large measure by the selfish action of the older men, who, availing themselves of the system of exchange, used their daughters and other female relatives to purchase wives for themselves instead of for their sons and nephews. The result was a very unequal distribution of wives between the males of the community, the old men often possessing many spouses, while the young men had to

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), p. 104; compare *id.*, pp. 554 *sq.*, "Indeed the method of capture, which has been so frequently described as characteristic of Australian tribes, is the very rarest way in which a Central Australian secures a wife." Compare E. Palmer, "Notes on some Australian Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii. (1884) p. 301, "Seldom was a woman taken by violence, or knocked on the head and dragged away, as has been said very often."

[2] A. W. Howitt, "On the Organisation of Australian Tribes," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Victoria*, 1889, pp. 118 *sq.*

go without any, or to put up with the cast-off wives of their elders. Among the tribes of Western Victoria, for example, "a young man, who belongs to the chief's family, very reluctantly seeks the consent of the head of the family to his marriage, for it frequently ends in the old chief taking the young woman himself. To such an extent is this tyrannical system of polygamy carried on by the old chiefs, that many young men are compelled to remain bachelors, the native word for which means 'to look out,' while an old warrior may have five or six of the finest young women of other tribes for his wives."[1] "Polygamy," says another writer on the Australian aborigines, "is universal; but it is generally the old men of the tribe who have the greatest number of wives. The reason of this is that they exchange their young daughters for young wives for themselves. Many of the young men are consequently without any, and the result is perpetual fights and quarrels about the women."[2] In South Australia "the females, and especially the young ones are kept principally among the old men, who barter away their daughters, sisters, or nieces, in exchange for wives for themselves or their sons. Wives are considered the absolute property of the husband, and can be given away, or exchanged, or lent, according to his caprice. A husband is denominated in the Adelaide dialect, *Yongarra martanya* (the owner or proprietor of a wife.)"[3] In Western Australia "the old men manage to keep the females a good deal amongst themselves, giving their daughters to one another, and the more female children they have, the greater chance have they of getting another wife, by this sort of exchange; but the women have generally some favourite amongst the young men, always looking forward to be his wife at the death of her husband."[4] In Queensland "it is, as a rule, difficult for young men to

of wives for themselves from among the young women, while the young men, having no women to give in exchange, were often obliged to remain single or to put up with the cast-off wives of their elders.

[1] James Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 35.

[2] Albert A. C. Le Souëf, "Notes on the Natives of Australia," in R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*, ii. 291.

[3] E. J. Eyre, *Journal of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (London, 1845), ii. 318 *sq.*

[4] (Sir) George Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia* (London, 1841), ii. 230. Compare to the same effect E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, i. 298, ii. 332, iii. 163; John Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland* (London and Leipsic, 1910), p. 162.

marry before they are thirty years old. The oldest men have the youngest and best-looking wives, while a young man must consider himself fortunate if he can get an old woman."[1]

Among the Australian aborigines the women whom men gave in exchange for wives were usually either their sisters or their daughters.

The two commonest forms of barter in the Australian matrimonial market were the exchange of daughters and the exchange of sisters, and it is not clear which of the two forms was the more prevalent, for our authorities differ on the subject, some of them assigning the palm in point of popularity to the one form, and some to the other.[2] Probably the usage varied somewhat in different tribes. In general it seems likely that in the rivalry between the older and the younger men for the possession of wives the older men would favour the exchange of daughters, because it gave them the chance of adding to their own harem, while the younger men would as naturally prefer the exchange of sisters, because it placed their matrimonial destiny in their own hands instead of in the hands of their venerable parents, the old bucks, whose personal designs on the youthful brides they had in many cases only too good reason to suspect. In some tribes, for example, in those of Western Victoria, "the rule is that a father alone can give away his daughter. If the father is dead the son can dispose of the daughter, with the consent of the uncle."[3] Similarly among some tribes of South Australia "brothers

[1] C. Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals*, p. 163.

[2] We have seen (p. 195) that according to Dr. Howitt "the most common practice is the exchange of girls by their respective parents as wives for each other's sons": and this conclusion seems on the whole to be borne out by the particular cases enumerated by Dr. Howitt in his *Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (pp. 177, 178, 217, 222, 242, 243, 244, 249, 253), though he also mentions cases of the exchange of sisters by their brothers (*op. cit.* pp. 211, 243, 252, 260, 262, 263). On the other hand the exchange of sisters by their brothers is sometimes mentioned as if it were the ordinary practice. See R. Brough Smyth, *Aborigines of Victoria*, i. 77 note * (John Bulmer quoted), 84; F. H. Wells, "The Habits, Customs, and Ceremonies of the Aboriginals on the Diamentina, Herbert, and Eleanor Rivers, in East Central Queensland," *Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Adelaide, South Australia, September 1893*, p. 515; Walter E. Roth, *Ethnological Studies among the North-West-Central Queensland Aborigines*, p. 181; *id.* "Marriage Ceremonies and Infant Life," *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10*, p. 11. Other writers mention the exchange both of daughters and of sisters as if they occurred indifferently. See above, pp. 195, 196, 197; and further E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, ii. 401, 474, iii. 122, 139.

[3] James Dawson, *Australian Aborigines*, p. 34.

often barter their sisters for wives for themselves, but it can only be done with the parents' consent, or after their death."[1] On the other hand among the Narrinyeri, a tribe of South Australia, "a girl was given in marriage, usually at an early age, sometimes by her father, but generally by her brother, and there was always an exchange of a sister, or other female relative, of the man to whom she was promised."[2] So common, indeed, among the Australian aborigines was this custom of bartering sisters at marriage that in some tribes of Southern Queensland men who had no sisters to offer in exchange had hardly any chance of being married at all.[3]

Of the two forms of barter, the exchange of sisters by their brothers was probably older than the exchange of daughters by their fathers, since the latter implies the recognition not only of paternity but of a father's right to dispose of his offspring, and there are strong grounds for believing that in aboriginal Australia and probably elsewhere the relations between the sexes were at one time so loose and vague that no man knew his own children or possessed any authority over them. On the other hand, even under such conditions, the relationship between brothers and sisters, the children of the same mother, must have been well known, and the recognition of that relationship probably conferred on brothers a degree of authority which enabled them to exchange their sisters or their sisters' daughters for other women, whom they either married themselves or gave in marriage to their sisters' sons. Thus in Australia, and perhaps in many other places, the right of disposing of a woman's hand in marriage may have been enjoyed by her brother or her mother's brother long before it devolved on her father. But as society progressed from group marriage, or from still laxer forms of commerce between the sexes,[4] to individual marriage, in other words,

Of the two forms of barter, the exchange of sisters is probably older than the exchange of daughters, since the exchange of daughters implies the recognition of paternity and a father's power to dispose of his offspring, whereas there is reason to think that in aboriginal Australia paternity was formerly unknown and a father had no authority over his children.

[1] E. J. Eyre, *Journals of Expeditions of Discovery into Central Australia* (London, 1845), ii. 319.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 260. Similarly G. Taplin, "The Narrinyeri," in J. D. Woods, *Native Tribes of South Australia*, p. 10, "Should the father be living he may give his daughter away, but generally she is the gift of her brother."

[3] E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race*, iii. 272.

[4] See below, pp. 229 *sqq.*

as sexual relations were more and more narrowed and confined to the cohabitation of single pairs, a man would gradually acquire an interest in, and an authority over, his wife's children, even before he became aware of the share he had had in begetting them; for the social position which he occupied as the husband, protector, and in some sense the owner of their mother, would give him rights over her offspring analogous to those which the owner of a cow possesses over her calves. Indeed to this day the very fact of physical paternity is unknown to many Australian tribes,[1] but their ignorance on that point does not prevent these savages from recognizing the mutual rights and duties of fathers and children, since these social rights and duties are both in theory and in practice perfectly distinct from, and independent of, the bond of blood between the persons. Hence to a superficial observer the position of a father to his children in these tribes might well appear not to differ materially from the corresponding position of a father to his children in Europe, although in point of fact the physical relationship between them, on which alone, to our thinking, the social relationship is based, has not so much as entered into the mind of the aborigines.[2] For these reasons we may fairly suppose that, with the progressive

[1] To the evidence collected by me elsewhere (*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, Third Edition, i. 99 *sqq.*) I may add Mrs. D. M. Bates, "Social Organization of some Western Australian Tribes," *Report of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Melbourne, 1913*, pp. 389 *sq.*; (Sir) Baldwin Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia* (London, 1914), pp. 263 *sqq.* "This belief in reincarnation, and in procreation not being actually the result of sexual intercourse, has been shown to be prevalent over the whole of the Central and Northern part of the continent—that is, over an area four and a half times the size of Great Britain—amongst many Queensland tribes and in a large part of West Australia . . . and I have little doubt but that at one time it was universally held amongst Australian tribes" (Sir Baldwin Spencer, *op. cit.* pp. 263 *sq.*).

[2] Similarly in regard to the natives of the Trobriand Islands, to the east of New Guinea, an acute observer tells us that they "are entirely ignorant of the existence of physiological impregnation," and that "in the native mind, the intimate relationship between husband and wife, and not any idea, however slight or remote, of physical fatherhood, is the reason for all that the father does for his children. It must be clearly understood that social and psychological fatherhood (the sum of all the ties, emotional, legal, economic) is the result of the man's obligations to his wife, and physiological fatherhood does not exist in the mind of the natives." See Bronislaw Malinowski, "Baloma; the Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvi. (1916) pp. 406, 410.

substitution of individual for group marriage, the right of disposing of a woman in marriage was gradually transferred from her brother or her maternal uncle to her father.

The custom of cross-cousin marriage would be a natural consequence and effect of the exchange of sisters in marriage.

But in whichever way the exchange of women in marriage was originally effected, whether by the brothers or by the fathers of the women, it is certain that the custom has been exceedingly common among the aborigines of Australia, and from it the custom of cross-cousin marriage might very easily arise. For when two men had thus married each other's sisters, their children would be cross-cousins, and what more natural than that these cross-cousins should in their turn marry each other when they came to maturity, as their parents had done before them? It is to be observed that such cross-cousins are related to each other by a twofold tie of consanguinity, since they are connected not, like ordinary cross-cousins, through one father and one mother only, but through both fathers and both mothers. For the father of each cousin is the brother of the other cousin's mother, and the mother of each cousin is the sister of the other cousin's father. In fact, the cousins are cross-cousins twice over, or what we may call double-cross cousins. It follows from this double-cross relationship that the female cousin stands to her male cousin in the relation both of mother's brother's daughter and of father's sister's daughter; hence their marriage combines the two forms of cross-cousin marriage which are usually distinguished, namely the marriage with a mother's brother's daughter and the marriage with a father's sister's daughter. Such a marriage is therefore a very close form of consanguineons union.

If cousin marriage is an effect of the exchange of sisters in marriage, it is probably older than the recognition of paternity and of a father's rights over his children.

But if the custom of exchanging sisters in marriage preceded not only the recognition of physical paternity but even the establishment of permanent social relations between a man and his offspring, it seems probable that the custom of marrying cousins, as a direct consequence of the interchange of sisters in marriage, also preceded both the recognition of paternity and the exercise of any authority by a father over his children. For if a man had the right of exchanging a sister for a wife, there seems to be no reason why he should not have effected the exchange as readily with a cousin as with any other man. Hence we need not,

with Dr. Rivers,[1] suppose that the authority of a father over his children was established before the practice of marrying cousins arose.

The origin of cross-cousin marriage in the interchange of sisters is confirmed by the present practice of the Kariera tribe.

The view that the custom of cross-cousin marriage originated in the interchange of sisters is supported by the present practice of the Kariera tribe, whose marriage system has been accurately observed and described by Mr. A. R. Brown. For in that tribe not only do men commonly exchange sisters in marriage, but the double-cross-cousins who result from such unions are also allowed and even encouraged to marry each other. The Kariera custom of cross-cousin marriage has already been noticed;[2] their custom of exchanging sisters in marriage, with its natural effect, the marriage of double-cross-cousins, may be best described in the words of Mr. A. R. Brown.[3] He says, "A common custom in this as in most Australian tribes is the exchange of sisters. A man, A, having one or more sisters finds a man, B, standing to him in the relation of *kumbali*[4] who also possesses a sister. These men each take a sister of the other as wife. As a result of this practice it often happens that a man's father's sister is at the same time the wife of his mother's brother. If these two have a daughter she will in the ordinary course of events become the man's wife. As the natives themselves put it to me, a man must look to his *kaga*[5] to provide him with a wife by giving him one or more of his daughters. The relative who is most particularly his *kaga*,[5] in the same sense that his own father is most particularly his *mama*,[6] is his mother's brother, who may or may not be at the same time the husband of his

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1915), ii. 327, "The cross-cousin marriage arises through a man giving his daughter to his sister's son in place of his wife, and this implies the presence, not only of individual marriage, but of the definite right of the father over his daughter which would thus enable him to bestow her upon his sister's son."

[2] See above, pp. 188 *sq.*

[3] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 156.

[4] That is, his mother's brother's son, father's sister's son, sister's husband, or wife's brother. See A. R. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 149. This and the following native terms of relationship are used in the wide classificatory or group sense. See below, pp. 227 *sq.*

[5] That is, his mother's brother, father's sister's husband, or wife's father. See A. R. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 149.

[6] That is, his father, father's brother, mother's sister's husband, or wife's mother's brother. See A. R. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 149.

father's sister. It is to this man that he looks first for his wife. If his own mother's brother has no daughter, or if she is already disposed of, he must apply to other persons who stand to him in the relation of *kaga*,[1] to the husband of his father's sister, for example. He may have to go much farther afield and apply to some distant *kaga*,[1] but this is only the case when there are available no nearer relatives. Thus we may say that the man who is pre-eminently *kaga*[1] (as his own father is pre-eminently *mama*)[2] is his mother's brother; the woman who is pre-eminently *toa*[3] is his own father's sister, who should be the wife of the *kaga*;[1] consequently the woman who is pre-eminently a man's *ñuba*[4] is the daughter of his own mother's brother, or failing this, of his own father's sister. It is this woman to whom he has the first right as a wife."

From this account we learn that among the Kariera the most proper marriage that can be contracted is that between first cousins who are doubly related to each other by blood, that is, both through the father and through the mother, since the husband's father is the wife's mother's brother, and the husband's mother is the wife's father's sister. In other words, a man marries a woman who is at the same time the daughter of his father's sister and of his mother's brother; and a woman marries a man who is at the same time the son of her mother's brother and of her father's sister; in short, husband and wife in such cases are double-cross-cousins. This double relationship by blood between the pair arises from the interchange of sisters as wives between their two fathers. In the cases, which sometimes occur, when an interchange of sisters did not take place between the parents of the intermarrying cousins, the husband and wife are related to each other only through the mother or through the father, not through both parents; the wife may stand to her husband in the relationship either of mother's brother's daughter or of father's sister's daughter; but she does not stand to him in both relationships simultaneously;

When two men have exchanged sisters in marriage, the cross-cousins born of such marriages are doubly related to each other both through their fathers and through their mothers: the man's wife is the daughter both of his mother's brother and of his father's sister, and the woman's husband is the son both of her father's sister and of her mother's brother.

[1] See note [5], p. 206.

[2] See note [6], p. 206.

[3] That is, his father's sister, mother's brother's wife, or wife's mother. See A. R. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 149.

[4] That is, his mother's brother's daughter, father's sister's daughter, wife, or wife's sister. See A. R. Brown, *op. cit.* p. 149.

in short, husband and wife in such cases are single-cross-cousins instead of double-cross-cousins. When the relationship of mother's brother's daughter is thus disjoined from the relationship of father's sister's daughter, the former is preferred by the Kariera as the ground of marriage; in other words, a man marries his mother's brother's daughter in preference to his father's sister's daughter. But if neither his mother's brother nor his father's sister has a daughter available as a wife for him, he is compelled to wed a more distant kinswoman, to whom, however, under the classificatory or group system of relationship he applies the same kinship term which he applies to his full cousin, the daughter either of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, or of both his mother's brother and his father's sister.

In such marriages a man's father-in-law is at once his mother's brother and the husband of his father's sister, and his mother-in-law is at once his father's sister and the wife of his mother's brother.

Lastly, it may be observed that in the case in which an interchange of sisters has taken place between the fathers of the intermarrying cousins, a man's father-in-law is at once his mother's brother and the husband of his father's sister; and his mother-in-law is at once his father's sister and the wife of his mother's brother. Conversely, under the same circumstances, a woman's father-in-law is at once her mother's brother and the husband of her father's sister; and her mother-in-law is at once her father's sister and the wife of her mother's brother. On the other hand, when no such interchange of sisters has taken place between the fathers of the intermarrying cousins, and the relationship between the cousins is consequently single, not double, namely either through the father or through the mother, but not through both parents simultaneously, then in that case a man's father-in-law is either his mother's brother or the husband of his father's sister, and his mother-in-law is either his father's sister or the wife of his mother's brother; and conversely a woman's father-in-law is either her mother's brother or the husband of her father's sister, and her mother-in-law is either her father's sister or the wife of her mother's brother.

When an interchange of sisters has not taken

In the Kariera tribe, as in many other Australian tribes, marriages are arranged by the older people while the future spouses are still small children. Thus, when a boy is growing up, he learns what girl is to be his wife. To the father

of the girl he owes certain duties, of which the chief is that he must make him presents from time to time.[1] This man, the boy's future father-in-law, ought to be in strictness, as we have just seen, both his mother's brother and his father's sister's husband rolled into one, though, in the imperfect state of things which is characteristic of this sublunary world, a young man may have to put up with a father-in-law who is either his mother's brother or his father's sister's husband, but not both at the same time; while he has to make shift with a mother-in-law who is in like manner either his father's sister or the wife of his mother's brother, but not both at the same time. He may sigh for the double relationship, but he takes up his cross and bears the single relationship as best he can.

place between the fathers of the inter-marrying cousins, the man's father-in-law is either his mother's brother or the husband of his father's sister, but not both at once.

Thus in the Kariera tribe the marriage of cross-cousins flows directly and simply, in the ordinary course of events, from the interchange of sisters in marriage. Given that interchange and the intermarriage of the resulting offspring, and we have cross-cousin marriage in its fullest form, namely the marriage of first cousins who are doubly related to each other both through their fathers and through their mothers; in short, we have the marriage of double-cross-cousins. But the interchange of sisters in marriage was common, we may almost say universal, in aboriginal Australia, while the marriage of cross-cousins was permitted or specially favoured in some tribes. It seems reasonable to suppose that in all Australian tribes which permitted or favoured the marriage of cross-cousins, such marriages were the direct consequence of the interchange of sisters in marriage and of nothing else. And that interchange of sisters flowed directly from the economic necessity of paying for a wife in kind, in other words of giving a woman in return for the woman whom a man received in marriage.

In all Australian tribes which permitted or favoured the marriage of cross-cousins, such marriages were probably the direct consequence of the exchange of sisters in marriage.

Having found in aboriginal Australia what appears to be a simple and natural explanation of cousin marriage, we are next led to inquire whether the same cause may not have had the same effect elsewhere; in other words, whether in other regions, where the marriage of cross-cousins is

The exchange of sisters in marriage co-exists with, and may be

[1] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 156.

the cause of, cross-cousin marriage in other races besides the Australian.

permitted or favoured, such unions may not flow directly from the interchange of sisters in marriage. There is some reason to think that it has been so. At all events we can show that the custom of interchanging sisters in marriage occurs in some of those regions where the custom of cross-cousin marriage prevails; and since in Australia these two customs appear to be related to each other as cause and effect, it is natural to suppose that the same causal relation obtains between the two customs when they are found conjoined elsewhere.

Thus the exchange of sisters in marriage co-exists with cross-cousin marriage in Southern India. Case of the Madigas.

Let us turn to what may be called the classic land of cousin marriage, Southern India, from which our first and most numerous instances of the custom were drawn. Among the Madigas of Mysore, a Dravidian caste who are believed to represent "the earliest stratum among the inhabitants of this country who have settled in towns and villages," "exchange of daughters [in marriage] is not only practised but is most commonly in use, the reason being the saving of the bride price by both parties."[1] Further, the Madigas, as we have already seen,[2] not only permit but favour the marriage of cross-cousins, thinking that a man's most suitable wife is his first cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister, though at the same time they deem a marriage with his niece, the daughter of his elder sister, equally appropriate. Finding the custom of the exchange of daughters in marriage thus practised along with the custom of the marriage of cross-cousins, we may reasonably infer that here, as in Australia, the practice of exchanging daughters in marriage is the direct source of the practice of uniting cross-cousins in marriage. And with the Madigas we are positively told that the motive for exchanging daughters in marriage is the purely economic one of saving the bride price, one woman being simply bartered for another instead of being paid for in cash or other valuable equivalent. Thus in India as in Australia the interchange of daughters in marriage, together with its natural sequel, the interchange of these daughters' daughters in marriage, in other words, the marriage of cross-

Economic advantage of the exchange of sisters in marriage: a man gets a wife without payment.

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xvii. *Mádiga Caste* (Bangalore, 1909), p. 11.

[2] Above, pp. 114 *sq.*

cousins, appears to originate in the simplest of economic motives, the wish and the necessity to pay for a woman in kind.

Exchange of daughters in marriage among the Dravidian castes of Mysore.

Similarly, among the Idigas, another Dravidian caste of Mysore, "exchange of daughters [in marriage] is allowed and practised. When two families exchange daughters, the *tera* or bride price is not, as a rule, paid by either party."[1] In other words, each of the two men gets a bride for nothing, for whom otherwise he would have had to pay a price. The cheapness of such a wedding cannot but constitute its great charm for poor or frugally-minded bridegrooms. Among the Dravidian castes of Mysore in general, who commonly permit or positively encourage the marriage of cross-cousins, the rule apparently is, that the interchange of daughters is also permitted but not much favoured; indeed, some castes positively discourage it on the ground that one of the two marriages which are thus contracted will prove unhappy.[2] The reason for this unfortunate result of the marriage is not alleged. We may conjecture that the objection is based on a fear of bringing together in marriage persons too near akin in blood, and therefore that, strictly speaking, the objection should only hold good against the interchange of daughters who are first cousins; for in that case each wife would stand

[1] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xviii. *Idiga Caste* (Bangalore, 1910), p. 6. We are not told that the Idigas practise cousin marriage, but we may perhaps infer it from the statement (*l.c.*) that "they observe the usual rules about the prohibited degrees of marriage." Apart from that, the marriage of cross-cousins is so general among the Dravidian castes of Southern India, that in the absence of indications to the contrary it may with a high degree of probability be assumed for any one of them.

[2] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, i. *Kuruba Caste*, p. 8 (exchange of daughters permitted but not common, the belief being that one or the other of the couples will not prosper); *id.* ii. *Holeya Caste*, p. 7 (allowable); *id.* iv. *Agasa Caste*, p. 6 (permitted); *id.* viii. *Bili Magga*, p. 2 (allowed); *id.* ix. *Tigali Caste*, p. 3 (recognized but discouraged); *id.* xi. *Vadda Caste*, p. 4 (not considered objectionable, though only rarely practised on account of the superstition that one of the married couples meets with bad luck); *id.* xii. *Nayinda Caste*, p. 6 (allowed, but it is believed that one of the two marriages will be unhappy); *id.* xiii. *Dombar Caste*, p. 5 (no objection); *id.* xiv. *Kadu-Gollas*, p. 5 (permitted, but not encouraged, from the belief that one of the wives will not prosper); *id.* xv. *Morasu Okkalu*, p. 13 (permitted, but some think it unlucky); *id.* xxi. *Uppara Caste*, p. 4 (no objection); *id.* xxiv. *Kumbáras Caste*, p. 4 (allowed, but not common); *id.* xxv. *Banjaras Caste*, p. 11 (allowed, but not much favoured; six months should elapse between the two marriages); *id.* xxvi. *Helavas*, p. 2 (allowed); *id.* xxvii. *Gangadikara Okkalu*, p. 3 (allowed, but not much favoured); *id.* xxxiii. *Gáṇigás*, p. 4 (permissible, but rarely takes place); *id.* xxxiv. *Dévángas*, p. 5 (allowed and practised).

to her husband in the relation both of mother's brother's daughter and of father's sister's daughter, and conversely her husband would stand to her in the relation both of mother's brother's son and of father's sister's son. In short, husband and wife would be double-cross-cousins to each other, each of them being related to the other through both father and mother; and though the Dravidians undoubtedly, as a rule, think that the marriage of single-cross-cousins is a very good thing, since they commonly prefer it, they may have scruples at the marriage of double-cross-cousins. Of course, in cases where daughters are interchanged between families which are unrelated to each other, there is no possible objection to the match on the ground of nearness of kin between the parties; and if my explanation of the Dravidian disinclination to the exchange of daughters is correct, the Dravidians should, in strict logic, have no scruple to such an exchange whenever the women are unrelated by blood. Perhaps, if we had fuller information as to the marriage customs of the Dravidians, we might find that it is so; in other words, that they only boggle at the exchange of daughters who are first cousins to each other, and that they feel no scruple at the exchange of daughters who are not so related. But since among the Dravidians the marriage of unrelated persons is the exception rather than the rule, it would be easy even for a careful and accurate observer to record the rule without noticing the exception.[1]

Exchange of sisters and cross-cousin marriage among the Bhotiyas.

Again, among the Bhotiyas of the Almora district in the United Provinces, who practise the marriage of cross-cousins, the exchange of sisters in marriage is said to be the rule; but the custom is not confined to them, it exists all over the district, and is not unknown even among the Khas Rajputs and Brahmans, though it is repugnant to the higher Hindoos of the plains of India.[2]

[1] Exchange of daughters is practised also among some tribes of the Central Indian Agency. See Captain C. E. Luard, *The Ethnographical Survey of the Central India Agency*, Monograph No. II. *The Jungle Tribes of Malwa* (Lucknow, 1909), p. 70 (the Mankar Bhils of Barwani), p. 71 (the Tarvi Bhils of Barwani); *id.*, Monograph IV. *Miscellaneous Castes* (Lucknow, 1909), p. 9 (the Jats of Barwani), p. 13 (the Khalpia Chamars of Barwani).

[2] Panna Lall, "An enquiry into the Birth and Marriage Customs of the Khasiyas and the Bhottiyas of Almora District, U.P.," *The Indian Antiquary*, xl. (1911) pp. 193 *sq.*

Exchange of sisters and cross-cousin marriage among the Garos.

Another Indian people among whom we find the custom of the interchange of daughters in marriage coexisting with the custom of cross-cousin marriage are the Garos. As we have seen,[1] the Garos belong to a totally different ethnical stock from the Dravidians; it is, therefore, all the more important to note the coexistence of the two customs among them. The rule of marriage among them is that "a man's sister should marry a son of the house of which his wife is daughter, his son may marry a daughter of that sister, and his daughter may marry his sister's son, who, in such case, comes to reside with his father-in-law and succeeds to the property in right of his wife and her mother,"[2] since among the Garos, as we saw, property descends through women instead of through men. From this clear and definite statement of a good authority we learn that among the Garos, as among the Australian aborigines, it is not only permissible but customary for a man to give his sister in marriage to the man whose sister he himself takes to wife; and further, that the double-cross-cousins born of these two pairs are free to marry each other, the male cousin marrying a girl who is the daughter both of his mother's brother and of his father's sister; while conversely the female cousin marries a young man who is the son both of her mother's brother and of her father's sister. Here again is it not natural to regard the marriage of the cousins as the direct effect of the interchange of sisters in marriage?

Exchange of daughters in marriage in Baluchistan.

Again, among the tribes of Baluchistan, who favour the marriage of cousins, the practice of exchanging daughters in marriage is much in vogue. Though among them the commonest, or at least the most characteristic, mode of procuring a wife is to pay for her, nevertheless "a much older form of marriage in Balūchistān, I fancy, is marriage by exchange, which under many names . . . flourishes in one form or another among all races to this day. . . . Even nowadays the family that has the least bother in finding brides for its sons is the family with an equal number of daughters to give in exchange."[3]

[1] Above, vol. i. p. 462.

[2] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1872), p. 63. Compare *Census of India, 1891, Assam*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait, vol. i. *Report* (Shillong, 1892), p. 229.

[3] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. iv. *Baluchistan*, by Denis Bray (Calcutta,

But the exchange of sisters or daughters in marriage need not necessarily lead to a practice of cross-cousin marriage. Case of the Western Islanders in Torres Straits.

But while the marriage of cross-cousins is a natural, it is not a necessary consequence of the interchange of daughters or sisters in marriage. That interchange may be customary even among tribes which discourage or forbid the marriage of all first cousins. For example, among the natives of the Western Islands in Torres Straits, as we have seen, marriages between first cousins rarely or never took place. Yet with these people the usual mode of obtaining a wife was to give a sister in exchange for her, and a man who happened to have no exchangeable sister might remain celibate all his life, unless he were rich enough to buy a wife, or unless his father were both rich and liberal enough to purchase one for him. If, however, a man had no sister whom he could barter, his mother's brother might come forward and give his nephew one of his daughters to exchange for a wife; indeed, it seems to have been the duty of the maternal uncle thus to step into the breach when a man's own father could do nothing for him. The price paid for a wife in these islands was heavy, hence a man had a strong pecuniary motive for procuring a bride by giving or promising a sister in exchange to the man whose sister he married; for in this way he got a wife practically for nothing. The natives whom Dr. Rivers questioned as to the practice of exchanging sisters in marriage "seemed to think that the custom was connected with that of payment for the bride"; and they were probably right in so thinking.[1]

Exchange of sisters in marriage at Mawatta in British New Guinea.

At Mawatta or Mowat, in British New Guinea, the regular mode of obtaining wives was in like manner by the exchange of sisters, and here also the economic advantage of getting a wife for nothing apparently helped to maintain, if it did not originate, the practice. We are told that in this district "it is a fixed law that the bridegroom's sister, if he has one unmarried, should go to the bride's brother or nearest male relative; she has no option. . . . Except in cases where the bridegroom has no sister no payment is made to

1913), p. 101. The cousins whose marriage the native of Baluchistan specially favours are not cross-cousins but ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers. See above, pp. 130 *sq.* However, the principle of exchange is not affected by the particular kind of cousinship existing between the spouses.

[1] *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. (Cambridge, 1904) pp. 231 *sq.*, 241 *sq.*

the parents of the bride until a child is born, when the husband presents his wife's father with a canoe or arm-shells, tomahawks, etc. . . . In these comparatively civilized days at Mawatta and elsewhere, it is becoming customary for men and women to marry without the exchange of sisters or payment. The customs above stated, however, generally prevail in the district."[1] From this account we gather that if a man gave a sister in exchange to his brother-in-law, he got his wife for nothing, though afterwards he had to make a present to his parents-in-law on the birth of his first child. On the other hand, if he had no sister to barter, he had to pay for his wife. Another and somewhat earlier account of the marriage customs at Mawatta confirms this inference and adds a few fresh details. "I cannot find out for a certainty," says the writer, "what are the forbidden degrees of consanguinity in relation to marriage, but, as far as practicable, the members of one family or descendants of one forefather, however remote, may not intermarry. Polygamy, but not polyandry, is practised; their reason for this custom is that the women do the principal part of the work in procuring vegetable or fish food. Marriage is arranged by the respective parents when the children are growing up, or in infancy and by exchange, thus: if a man has sisters and no brother, he can exchange a sister for a wife, but in the case of both brothers and sisters in a family, the eldest brother exchanges the eldest sister, and the brothers as they are old enough, share equally, but if the numbers are unequal, the elder takes the preference. It sometimes happens that a man has no sister and he cannot obtain a wife. Sometimes a wife is procured by purchase."[2] Here, again, it

[1] B. A. Hely, "Native Habits and Customs in the Western Division," *Annual Report on British New Guinea, 1892–1893* (Brisbane, 1894), p. 57.

[2] E. Beardmore, "The Natives of Mowat, Daudai, New Guinea," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix. (1890) pp. 460 *sq*. The writer's statement as to the exchange of sisters in the case of a family in which there are several brothers is not clear. He seems to mean that if there are as many sisters as brothers in a family, each brother as he grows up will exchange a sister for a wife in order of seniority; but that if there are more brothers than sisters, the elder brothers will give the sisters in exchange for wives, and the younger brothers, having no sisters to give in exchange, will have to go without wives, or perhaps to get them by purchase. He cannot mean, as his words might seem to imply, that in such a case the younger brothers share the wives of their elder brothers, since he expressly affirms that polyandry is not practised in the district.

appears that, as in aboriginal Australia, a man who has no sister to give in exchange may have to go without a wife, and here, too, as in aboriginal Australia, a wife has a high economic value as a labourer and a food purveyor. It seems reasonable, therefore, to conclude that here, as apparently in aboriginal Australia, the primary motive for the exchange of daughters or sisters in marriage is an economic one, the desire to get a valuable article at the cheapest possible rate. But apparently at Mawatta, as in the Western Islands of Torres Straits, the exchange of daughters or sisters in marriage has not as a necessary consequence the exchange of these women's children in marriage; in other words, it does not lead to the marriage of cross-cousins, since we are told that all consanguineous marriages are, as far as possible, avoided.

Exchange of women as wives in Kiwai, off the coast of New Guinea.

In the Pededarimu tribe of Kiwai, an island off the coast of British New Guinea, the practice of exchanging women as wives also prevails, but a different motive is assigned for it. A woman at marriage takes her husband's totem, and "for this reason a man when he marries has to give to the brother, or nearest male relative to the bride, his sister, foster-sister, or a female relative, to keep up the strength of the sept from which he takes his wife."[1] No doubt the practice of exchanging women in marriage may be observed from a variety of motives, one of which in certain cases may well be the desire to keep up a sept at full strength by only parting with women on condition of receiving an equal number of women in exchange. But such a motive of public policy seems less simple and primitive than the purely economic motive which I take to be at the base of the custom; for while the economic motive appeals directly to every man in his individual capacity, the public motive appeals to men in their collective capacity as members of a community, and therefore is likely to affect only that enlightened minority who are capable of subordinating their private interest to the public good.

Whatever the causes which have contributed to its popularity, the practice of exchanging daughters in marriage

[1] *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. (Cambridge, 1904) p. 189, quoting B. A. Hely.

would seem to be widespread in New Guinea. Thus among the Banaros, who inhabit the middle course of the Keram River in German New Guinea, the custom is in full operation and is elaborately worked out in every detail. When a girl has reached the age of puberty and has passed through the initiation ceremonies, she consults with her mother as to which of the marriageable youths suits her best. Her mother discusses the matter with her husband, and if they agree, she prepares a pot of boiled sago, which they then carry in a basket to the parents of the chosen bridegroom. The families concerned confer with each other and come to a formal agreement. But as compensation for the girl who is given to be the bride of a young man of the one family, a sister of the bridegroom must be married to the bride's brother.[1] Again, the natives of the northern coast of Dutch New Guinea are said to regard their marriageable daughters as wares which they can sell without consulting the wishes of the girls themselves; and similarly a man is reported to look on his wife as a piece of property which has been bought and paid for, and adultery is thought equivalent to theft, because it infringes the proprietary rights of the husband. But on Djamma and the surrounding islands a mode of contracting marriage is in vogue which allows the parties, in the language of the writer who reports it, "to pay each other without opening their purses." When a man has a nubile daughter, and another man asks the hand of the damsel for his son, the father of the bridegroom must give a daughter to be the wife of the bride's brother; and if he has no daughter, he must give a niece instead. But should it happen that he has neither daughter nor niece to provide as an equivalent, the projected marriage falls through.[2]

Exchange of daughters in marriage customary in other parts of New Guinea.

The economic motive for such marriages, here implied rather than expressed, is stated without ambiguity in an account of the connubial customs of the Santals, a primitive tribe of Bengal, among whom the commonest and most

Exchange of daughters in marriage among the Santals of Bengal.

[1] Richard Thurnwald, "Bánaro Society," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, vol. iii. No. 4, Oct.–Dec. 1916 (Lancaster, Pa., U.S.A.), pp. 258 *sq.*

[2] F. J. F. van Hasselt, "De huwelijksregeling voor de Papoesche Christenen, op Noord-Nieuw-Guinea," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, lviii. (Rotterdam, 1914) p. 215.

honourable way to get a wife is to buy her. "A man who has a son and a daughter of marriageable age, and who is not in a position to pay the *pōn* or price for a wife for his son, calls in a go-between and commissions him to look out for a family in a like position, so that they may exchange daughters for wives to their sons. In such cases the sister must be younger than her brother, otherwise a marriage of this sort cannot take place. As there is a fair exchange of one daughter for another, there is no *pōn* or compulsory giving of presents."[1] Again, in the French Sudan by far the commonest way of getting a wife is by paying for her; "but among the Senoufos the price of purchase is often replaced by a woman; this is what is called 'marriage by exchange.' Instead of a 'dowry' the bride's brother receives a wife, who is generally the own sister of the bridegroom; in certain provinces this custom has disappeared, but it is understood that when once the son-in-law is married and has become a father, he will give his parents-in-law the first daughter born of the marriage."[2] So, too, among the Mossis of the French Sudan the usual way of obtaining a bride is to give presents to her parents, but they also practise the exchange of daughters. A family will promise one of its girls to another family as a bride for one of their sons, and the family who receives her provides in return a daughter to marry a son of the other family. But if a young man gets a girl to wife without paying for her, and without giving a sister or other woman in exchange, the father of the girl has the right to dispose of the first daughter born of the marriage; he may take her to his house as soon as she is weaned and may marry her to whom he likes afterwards.[3] The strictly mercantile, not to say mercenary, character of these connubial transactions lies on the surface.

Exchange of daughters in marriage among the tribes of the French Sudan.

Exchange of daughters in marriage among the natives of Sumatra.

The economic motive which prompts the exchange of women, and particularly of sisters, in marriage is put clearly forward by Marsden, the historian of Sumatra, in the account which he gives of marriage customs in that great island.

[1] Hon. and Rev. A. Campbell, D.D., "Santal Marriage Customs," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, ii. (Bankipore, 1916) pp. 306, 331.

[2] Maurice Delafosse, *Haut-Sénégal-Niger*, Première Série, iii. *Les Civilisations* (Paris, 1912), pp. 68 *sq.*, 70 note[1].

[3] Louis Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), pp. 544 *sq.*

He tells us that among the Sumatrans there are three modes of contracting marriage, of which one is by *jujur*: "The *jujur* is a certain sum of money, given by one man to another, as a consideration for the person of his daughter, whose situation, in this case, differs not much from that of a slave to the man she marries, and to his family. . . . In lieu of paying the *jujur*, a barter transaction, called *libei*, sometimes takes place, where one *gadis* (virgin) is given in exchange for another; and it is not unusual to borrow a girl for this purpose, from a friend or relation, the borrower binding himself to replace her, or pay her *jujur*, when required. A man who has a son and daughter, gives the latter in exchange for a wife to the former. The person who receives her, disposes of her as his own child, or marries her himself. A brother will give his sister in exchange for a wife, or, in default of such, procure a cousin for the purpose."[1] Here the giving of a daughter or a sister in exchange for a wife is definitely described as a form of barter which is substituted for the payment of a bride price.

Exchange of daughters in marriage among the peasantry of Palestine.

Among the peasantry of Palestine to this day the exchange of sisters as wives is practised for the same simple economic reason which has everywhere recommended that form of marriage to indigent or niggardly suitors. "In most cases," we are informed, "the girls are virtually sold by their parents, the dowry going to the father, and it is this which makes the birth of a girl so much more welcome among the Fellahîn than among the townspeople, where the dowry does not go to the parents. Considerable sums are paid for girls who are good-looking, well-connected, or clever at any of the Fellahîn industries. . . . In cases where a man has little or no money, or his credit is not good enough to enable him to borrow sufficient to pay the dowry of an unmarried girl, he will marry a widow, as a much smaller sum is required in such cases, especially if she have children. Another device is not unfrequently resorted to by poor people. Yakûb, for instance, wants to marry, but has no prospect whatever of raising even a moderate sum of money. He has, however, an unmarried sister, Latîfeh, so he looks about for a family similarly circumstanced to his own, and

[1] William Marsden, *The History of Sumatra* (London, 1811), pp. 257, 259.

finds another man, Salâmeh, who is also desirous of entering the married state, but who, like Yakûb, is too poor to do so. He, too, has an unmarried sister, Zarîfeh, and so an exchange is arranged between the two families, Yakûb marrying Zarîfeh, and Salâmeh Latîfeh, no dowry being paid on either side." [1]

The custom of exchanging sisters or daughters in marriage might easily and naturally lead to the custom of cross-cousin marriage.

On the whole, then, it seems probable that the practice of exchanging daughters or sisters in marriage was everywhere at first a simple case of barter, and that it originated in a low state of savagery where women had a high economic value as labourers, but where private property was as yet at so rudimentary a stage that a man had practically no equivalent to give for a wife except another woman. The same economic motive might lead the offspring of such unions, who would be cross-cousins, to marry each other, and thus in the easiest and most natural manner the custom of cross-cousin marriage would arise and be perpetuated. If the history of the custom could be followed in the many different parts of the world where it has prevailed, it might be possible everywhere to trace it back to this simple origin ; for under the surface alike of savagery and of civilization the economic forces are as constant and uniform in their operation as the forces of nature, of which, indeed, they are merely a peculiarly complex manifestation.[2]

[1] Rev. C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land* (London, 1906), pp. 109 *sq.* As an exception to the general rule I note that in the Buin district of Bougainville, one of the Solomon Islands, the exchange of women, which is considered the regular form of marriage, appears not to supersede the need of paying for them. "In the ideal case the brother of the bride takes the sister of the bridegroom. On such an occasion the buying is not eliminated, but the payment of an equal amount of money and wares is carefully executed, so that the price for the brides is evenly exchanged." See R. Thurnwald, "Bánaro Society," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, iii. No. 4, Oct.–Dec. 1916 (Lancaster, Pa., U.S.A.), pp. 285 *sq.* But since we are told that "the price of the brides is evenly exchanged," it follows that the exception to the rule is more apparent than real. If two men pay each other half-a-crown, the net result is precisely the same as if they had neither paid nor received anything.

[2] A different explanation of cross-cousin marriage, though one that is also based on economic considerations, has been suggested by Mr. F. J. Richards. He supposes that the custom arose under a system of mother-kin, which prevented a man from transmitting his property to his own children, and obliged him to transmit it to his sister's son, his legal heir. Under such a system, when paternity came to be recognized, a man would naturally wish to make some provision for his own children, and this he could do for his daughter by marrying her to his legal heir, his sister's son ; for thus the

§ 13. *Why is the Marriage of Ortho-Cousins forbidden?*

But we have still to ask, why is the marriage of ortho-cousins forbidden?

But if we have found an answer to the question, Why is the marriage of cross-cousins so commonly favoured? we have still to find an answer to the question, Why is the marriage of ortho-cousins so commonly forbidden? On the theory which I have suggested for the marriage of cross-cousins, there is no apparent reason for prohibiting the marriage of ortho-cousins. If a man marries the daughter of his mother's brother or of his father's sister in preference to any other woman because he can get her for nothing, why should he not marry the daughter of his mother's sister or of his father's brother for precisely the same reason? Regarded from the purely economic point of view there seems to be no difference between the women.

The marriage of ortho-cousins is prevented by the dual organization or system of two exogamous

A partial or preliminary answer to the question has incidentally been given in describing the rules as to the marriage of cousins in some parts of Melanesia and Australia. We have seen that when a community is divided into two exogamous classes, ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, necessarily belong to the same exogamous class and are therefore forbidden to marry each

girl would enjoy a share of her father's inheritance through marriage with her cross-cousin, the son of her father's sister. In this way, on Mr. Richards' hypothesis, the custom of the cross-cousin marriage arose; it was an attempt to combine the conflicting claims of mother-kin and father-kin; or, as Mr. Richards puts it with special reference to Southern India, it was "a sort of compromise between matrilineal succession and Brahmanic law." See F. J. Richards, "Cross Cousin Marriage in South India," *Man*, xiv. (1914) pp. 194-198. But this view is open to serious objections. In the first place, while it might explain why a man should wish to marry his daughter to his sister's son, it does not explain why he should wish to marry his son to his sister's daughter; thus, though it might account for the one form of the cross-cousin marriage, namely, the marriage of a man with his mother's brother's daughter, it does not account for the other form, namely, the marriage of a man with his father's sister's daughter. In fact, while it shows how under a system of mother-kin a man might provide for his daughter, it omits to show how he might provide for his son, which he would probably be at least as anxious to do. In the second place, assuming as it does the practical, though not the legal, recognition of paternity, and the accumulation of heritable property, the theory appears to place the origin of the cross-cousin marriage far too late in the history of society; for, as I have already indicated, the custom of marriage between cross-cousins probably dates from a time when physical paternity and the accumulation of heritable property were both alike unknown; in short, it originated in extreme ignorance and extreme poverty, if not in absolute destitution.

classes, which prevails among the aborigines of Australia and to a less extent in Melanesia.

other by the fundamental law which prohibits all members of the same exogamous class to unite in marriage with each other. As the division into two or more exogamous classes is practically universal among the aborigines of Australia, it follows that in these tribes the marriage of ortho-cousins, the children of two sisters or of two brothers, is everywhere barred. On the other hand under the system of two exogamous classes or, as it may be called for short, the dual organization, cross-cousins, the children of a brother and a sister respectively, always belong to different exogamous classes and are therefore so far marriageable, although some tribes, such as the Dieri, forbid the union of such relatives by a special law superadded to the exogamous prohibitions.

In Melanesia the division of society into two or more exogamous classes is by no means so uniform and regular as it is in Australia, but it is sufficiently prevalent to render it probable that the dual organization, that is, the division of the community into two exogamous classes, once prevailed universally in this region,[1] and that the prohibition of the marriage of ortho-cousins among the Melanesians is a direct consequence of that social system.

The dual organization has probably existed and created the custom of cross-cousin marriage wherever that custom is found. The evidence for the prevalence of the dual

But we have found the same prohibition enforced in many other parts of the world, including Asia, Africa, and America. Are we to suppose that among all these widely scattered peoples the prohibition of the marriage of ortho-cousins is everywhere a relic of a dual organization, that is, of the division of society into two exogamous and intermarrying classes? At first sight the answer to this question might be in the negative; for with the exception of a few tribes in North America, and of a few doubtiful traces in India,[2] the dual organization is not positively known to have prevailed anywhere outside

[1] This is the view of Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, than whom no one is more competent to express an opinion on the subject. See his *History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1915), ii. 314. I differ, however, from Dr. Rivers in thinking that in Melanesia, as to all appearance in Australia, the dual organization was probably the result of a voluntary and deliberate bisection of the community for the purpose of marriage rather than the effect of an accidental fusion of two different peoples. For Dr. Rivers's arguments in favour of the production of the dual organization by fusion rather than by fission, see his *History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 556 *sqq.*

[2] See R. V. Russell, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), i. 144, "In one part of Bastar all the Gond clans

Australia and Melanesia. Yet there are strong reasons for believing that it was at one time universal throughout these vast regions, in fact that it once overspread a half or more than a half of the habitable globe. The grounds for thinking so are mainly two: first, the existence of totemism throughout a large part of the area in question; and, second, the existence of what is called the classificatory or, as I should prefer to call it, the group system of relationship throughout the whole of the area. Let us look at these grounds separately.

organization is twofold, first, totemism, and second, the classificatory system of relationship.

First, with regard to totemism. In totemic society, if we leave out of account a large group of tribes in Central Australia, the rule of exogamy is nearly universal;[1] in other words, no man is allowed to marry a woman of his own totemic clan. This fundamental law of course prohibits the marriage of brothers and sisters, because they necessarily belong to the same hereditary clan, whether they take it from their mother or from their father. But as a woman's children always belong to a different totemic clan from that of her brother's children, it follows that these children, who are cross-cousins, are always marriageable with each other, so far as the law of exogamy is concerned. On the other hand, the children of two brothers commonly belong to the same exogamous clan and are therefore not marriageable with each other; and the children of two sisters commonly belong to the same exogamous clan, and are therefore not marriageable with each other. Thus it follows directly from the law of totemic exogamy that the marriage of cross-cousins is universally permitted and the marriage of ortho-cousins is commonly barred. So far there might seem to be little or no difference between the law of totemic exogamy and the law of class exogamy in their effect on the permission or the prohibition of marriage between cousins. Yet there is an important difference between the two. For whereas under the dual organization a community is divided

First, in regard to totemism as evidence of the former prevalence of the dual organization. The exogamy of the totemic clans prevents the marriage of ortho-cousins in certain cases, but it does not, like the dual organization or system of two-class exogamy, prevent it in all cases.

are divided into two classes without names, and a man cannot marry a woman belonging to any clan of his own class, but must take one from a clan of the other class. Elsewhere the Gonds are divided into two groups of six-god and seven-god worshippers among whom the same rule obtains." Compare *id.* iii. 64 *sqq.*

[1] There are a few exceptions to the rule. See *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 8 *sqq.*

into two exogamous sections only, under totemism a community is commonly divided into a much larger number of exogamous sections or totemic clans, and as a rule a man, instead of being restricted in his choice of a wife to a single clan, is free to choose his wife from several clans. From this it follows that under the normal totemic system two brothers may marry women of two different totemic clans, and if descent of the totemic clan is in the female line, the children of the one brother will in that case belong to a different totemic clan from the children of the other brother, and thus the children of these two brothers will be marriageable with each other. Similarly, under the normal totemic system two sisters may marry men of two different totemic clans, and if descent of the totem is in the male line, the children of the one sister will in that case belong to a different totemic clan from the children of the other sister, and thus the children of these two sisters will be marriageable with each other. Hence totemism of the usual hereditary type, by giving a considerable range of choice of wives, renders it possible for ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, to be marriageable with each other; only it must be observed that both classes of ortho-cousins cannot under any circumstances be marriageable in the same totemic community; and in any particular community it will depend on the mode of reckoning descent whether the children of two brothers or the children of two sisters can become marriageable with each other. If descent is traced in the female line, the children of two sisters can never be marriageable, because they must necessarily have the same totem, namely, the totem of their mothers; but the children of two brothers will be marriageable, if the brothers had married women of two different totemic clans, because in that case the children will have different totems, namely, the totems of their mothers. Conversely, if descent is traced in the male line, the children of two brothers can never be marriageable, because they must necessarily have the same totem, namely, the totem of their fathers; but the children of two sisters will be marriageable, if the sisters had married men of two different totemic clans, because in that case the children will have different totems, namely, the

totems of their fathers. Thus totemism of the normal type opens the door to the marriage of one sort of ortho-cousins, but not to the marriage of both sorts of ortho-cousins simultaneously. With female descent of the totem, the door is opened to the marriage of the children of two brothers, but not to the marriage of the children of two sisters; with male descent, conversely, the door is opened to the marriage of the children of two sisters, but not to the marriage of the children of two brothers. On the other hand, under the dual organization or two-class system of exogamy, all marriages of ortho-cousins, the children alike of two brothers and of two sisters, are universally barred.

The system of totemic exogamy much less rigid and comprehensive than the system of two-class exogamy.

Thus, the system of totemic exogamy is far less comprehensive than the system of two-class exogamy; for when once the two exogamous classes are broken up into a number of exogamous fragments or clans, each independent of the other, opportunities are afforded for evading some of the prohibitions which were enforced under the dual organization. In fact, whereas under totemism, compared with the dual organization, the law of exogamy might seem to be tightened through the multiplication of the exogamous sections, it is in reality relaxed, except in the very rare cases in which a man is limited in the choice of his wife to the women of a single totemic clan. Such a limitation, which prevailed in the Urabunna tribe of Central Australia,[1] undoubtedly stretches the prohibitions of marriage far beyond the limits which they reach under the dual organization, since it confines a man to the women of a small fraction of the community instead of allowing him one-half of the women to pick and choose from; but as a general rule totemism, when it has once shaken off the trammels of the exogamous classes, opens up to every man a much larger matrimonial field than he commanded under the dual organization; the totemic clans, instead of serving as fresh bars to shut him up in the exogamous prison, are really so many doors thrown open to facilitate his escape from it. Thus, the broad principle of exogamy, which stands out with a

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), p. 61; *id.*, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), p. 71.

sort of massive grandeur in the dual organization, is frittered away, as it were, into small pieces under totemism of the normal type. Of this process of detrition the new licence granted in certain cases to the marriage of ortho-cousins is a conspicuous instance.

It seems probable that the exogamy of the totemic clans everywhere originated in the system of two-class exogamy, which it has survived in a great part of the area now occupied by totemism.

I have spoken of two-class exogamy or the dual organization as if it preceded totemic exogamy in order of time and was afterwards superseded by it. The evidence in favour of that conclusion I believe to be strong. In fact, totemic exogamy would seem to have been a parasitic organism which fastened upon and finally killed its host, namely, class exogamy. If we may judge from the totemic system and traditions of Central Australia, where totemism is found in its most primitive form, what happened was this.[1] Originally the rule of exogamy was unknown in the totemic clans; indeed, far from being forbidden to marry women of his own totemic clan, men married them by preference. Afterwards the growing aversion to the marriage of near kin resulted in a practical reform, which divided the whole tribe into two exogamous classes, with a rule, as the name exogamous implies, that no man might marry a woman of his own class but that every man might marry a woman of the other class only. In pursuance of this division of the tribe some of the totemic clans were placed in the one exogamous class and some in the other, with the necessary result that all of them became thenceforth exogamous, which they had not been before. In time the exogamous rule of the two classes was found to be burdensome, since it cut off every man in the tribe, roughly speaking, from half the women of the community. Hence it came more and more to be neglected, and men were content to observe the exogamous rule of their own particular totemic clan, which, if there were many totemic clans, only cut them off from a comparatively small fraction of the women. Thus the yoke of the exogamous prohibitions was immensely lightened by substituting the rule of totemic exogamy for the rule of class exogamy, in fact by gradually dropping the exogamous classes altogether. Thus it has come about that while totemism, with

[1] With what follows compare *sq.*, 162 *sq.*, 165 *sqq.*, 256 *sqq.*, iv. *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 103, 123 127 *sqq.*

its rule of exogamy applied to the totemic clans, has continued to survive down to modern times over a considerable part of the world, the two-class system of exogamy, which was the parent of totemic exogamy, has totally disappeared over a great portion of that vast area, having been eaten up by its unnatural offspring. But wherever we find totemism with its characteristic rule of exogamy applied to the totemic clans, we may strongly suspect that there was once the two-class system of exogamy, in other words, the dual organization of society.

Second, in regard to the classificatory or group system of relationship as evidence of the former prevalence of the dual organization.

Thus totemism, wherever it exists, affords a presumption of the former existence of the dual organization or the division of a community into two exogamous and intermarrying classes. But I have said that a second argument in favour of the former existence of the dual organization is afforded by the classificatory or group system of relationship, wherever that system of relationship is found. To a consideration of that system we must now turn for a short time. The system is well worthy of attention, for it forms one of the great landmarks in the history of mankind.

Collectivism and savagery *versus* individualism and civilization.

The distinction between the classificatory and the descriptive systems of relationship, or as I should prefer to put it, the distinction between the system of group relationship and the system of individual relationship, coincides, broadly speaking, with the distinction between savagery and civilization; the boundary between the lower and the higher strata of humanity runs approximately on the line between the two different modes of counting kin, the one mode counting it by groups, the other by individuals.[1] Reduced to its most general terms, the line of cleavage is between collectivism and individualism: savagery stands on the side of collectivism, civilization stands on the side of individualism.

The classificatory system of relationship is a system of relationship between groups of people rather than between individuals.

The classificatory or group system of relationship, which the evidence tends more and more to prove to be practically universal among savages and even among some peoples who have advanced considerably beyond the stage of savagery, is essentially a system of relationship between groups.[2]

[1] Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 151 *sq.*

[2] Compare Lorimer Fison, "The Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 367; (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), p. 95; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 286 *sqq.*, 289 *sqq.*

Under it every man applies the term father to a whole group of men, only one of whom begat him; he applies the term mother to a whole group of women, only one of whom bore him; he applies the term brother to a whole group of men with most or even all of whom he may have no blood relationship; he applies the term sister to a whole group of women with most or even all of whom he may in like manner have no blood relationship; he applies the name wife to a whole group of women, with none of whom he need have marital relations, since he applies the term to all of them even before it is physically possible for him to marry any one of them; he applies the term son to a whole group of men, not one of whom he may have begotten, and many of whom may be much older than himself; and he applies the name daughter in like manner to a whole group of women, not one of whom he may have begotten, and many of whom may be much older not only than himself but than his mother. And similarly with the terms expressive of more distant relationships; they too are stretched so as to include whole groups of persons of both sexes with whom the speaker need not have a drop of blood in common. This extraordinary elasticity in the use of terms of relationship is at first very bewildering to a European, accustomed to the rigidity of his own system of individual relationship, and he is apt to mistake the elasticity for vagueness and confusion. But that is not so. On the contrary, where the system exists in full force, as among the aborigines of Australia, it is much more precise and definite than ours; under it every man knows to a hair's breadth the exact relationship in which he stands to all the other men and all the women of the community. More than that, when a stranger comes into an Australian tribe, the first thing his hosts do is to ascertain precisely the various degrees of kinship which can be traced between him and them all; and if he cannot furnish the necessary particulars he stands a very fair chance of being summarily knocked on the head.[1]

[1] Compare A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 150 *sq.*, who says (p. 151), "When a stranger comes to a camp that he has never visited before, he does not enter the camp, but remains at some distance. A few of the older men, after a while, approach him, and the first thing they

The classificatory or group system of relationship greatly extends the number of women whom a man is free to marry.

This extremely elastic system of relationship possesses at least one conspicuous advantage in that, by greatly extending the group of women in which a man is compelled to seek a wife, it relieves him to some extent from the limitations imposed on his matrimonial freedom by the numerous and often burdensome rules which he deems himself bound to observe in choosing a mate, and which, but for the relief thus afforded him, might frequently doom him to a life of celibacy for want of any woman whom he might legitimately marry. For example, when it is prescribed that a man ought to marry a particular sort of first or second cousin, it may often happen that he has no woman who stands to him in that relationship by blood, and that consequently he might, on our European system of kinship, be reduced to the alternative of breaking the law or remaining a bachelor for the rest of his days. In this painful dilemma the classificatory or group system of relationship comes to his rescue by pointing out to him that he need not confine his young affections to the narrow circle of his blood cousins, which indeed, in the case supposed, has contracted to the vanishing point, but that he may extend them to a very much larger circle of classificatory or group cousins, to any one of whom, nay to all of them, he is at perfect liberty to offer his heart and his hand. In this way the shrewd savage contrives to slip through the meshes of the matrimonial net which his elaborate system of marriage restrictions casts about his feet. While he lays a burden on his back with one hand, he manages to lighten it considerably with the other.

What is the origin of this remarkable system of classificatory or group relationship, which appears from one point of view so rigid, and from another point of view so elastic,

proceed to do is to find out who the stranger is. The commonest question that is put to him is, 'Who is your *maeli?*' (father's father). The discussion proceeds on genealogical lines until all parties are satisfied of the exact relation of the stranger to each of the natives present in the camp. When this point is reached, the stranger can be admitted to the camp, and the different men and women are pointed out to him and their relation to him defined. . . . If I am a blackfellow and meet another blackfellow, that other must be either my relative or my enemy. If he is my enemy I shall take the first opportunity of killing him, for fear he will kill me. This, before the white man came, was the aboriginal view of one's duty towards one's neighbour."

The classificatory or group system of relationship reflects exactly the system of group marriage in which it probably originated.

at once so exacting and so accommodating? It appears to have originated in, and to reflect as in a mirror, a system of group marriage, that is, the marital rights exercised by a definite group of men over a definite group of women at a time when individual marriage, or the appropriation of one woman by one man, was still unknown.[1] The relations constituted by the rights of the groups of men over the groups of women are expressed and, as it were, crystallized in the system of group relationship, which has survived in many parts of the world long after the system of group marriage has disappeared. The system of group relationship may be compared to a cast taken of the living system of group marriage: that cast represents the original in all the minute details of its organic structure, and continues to record it for the instruction of posterity long after the organism itself is dead and mouldered into dust. In Central Australia the system of group marriage persisted, along with the system of group relationship, down to our own time;[2]

[1] Compare Lorimer Fison, "The Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) pp. 360 *sqq.*; (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 55 *sqq.*; *iid.*, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 95, 140 *sqq.*; A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 156 *sqq.*; *id.*, "Australian Group-Relationships," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907) p. 284; W. H. R. Rivers, "On the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationship," *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor* (Oxford, 1907), pp. 309 *sqq.*; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 303 *sqq.*, iv. 121 *sqq.* "The features of the classificatory system of relationship as we find them at the present time have arisen out of a state of group-marriage. . . . The kind of society which most readily accounts for its chief features is one characterized by a form of marriage in which definite groups of men are the husbands of definite groups of women" (Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, *op. cit.* p. 323). This relation of a definite group of husbands to a definite group of wives is concisely and accurately described by the term "group marriage," which implies, first, the limitation of sexual relations to groups, and second, the recognition of these relations as legitimate. Yet Dr. Rivers has since discarded it for the clumsier and less definite phrase "organized sexual communism" (*Kinship and Social Organisation*, London, 1914, p. 86), which fails to indicate that very limitation of sexual relations to definite groups on which Dr. Rivers himself justly lays emphasis, and which is clearly indicated by the term "group marriage." Hence it seems to me that the state of things in which, with Dr. Rivers, I believe the classificatory system of relationship to have originated, is both more exactly and more conveniently described by the term "group marriage" than by the phrase "organized sexual communism."

[2] Particularly in the Dieri and Urabunna tribes. See A. W. Howitt, "The Dieri and other kindred tribes of Central Australia," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx. (1891) pp. 53 *sqq.*; *id.*, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, pp. 175 *sqq.*; (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*,

and it is perhaps the only part of the world where the original and the cast have been found together, the one still superposed, as it were, on the other and fitting it to some extent, though not with perfect exactness; for even here the living system of group marriage had shrunk and was probably wasting away.

In aboriginal Australia the classificatory or group system of relationship is based on the division of the community into two exogamous and intermarrying groups or classes. The division of the Australian community into two, four, or eight exogamous classes seems to have been deliberate and purposeful.

From a study of the Australian tribes, which have preserved both the cast and something of the original, in other words, both the system of group-relationship and the system of group marriage, more perfectly than any other known race of men, we can define with some approach to exactness the nature and extent of the intermarrying groups on which the terms of group relationship were modelled. Among the Australian aborigines, these intermarrying groups are regularly two, four, or eight in number, according to the tribe; for some tribes have two such exogamous groups, others have four, and others again have eight.[1] Where the system is in full working order and has not fallen into obvious decay, the number of the exogamous classes is invariably two or a multiple of two, never an odd number. This suggests, what all the evidence tends to confirm, that these various groups have been produced by the deliberate and repeated bisection of a community, first into two, then into four, and finally into eight exogamous and intermarrying groups or classes; for no one, so far as I know, has yet ventured to maintain that society is subject to a physical law, in virtue of which communities, like crystals, tend automatically and unconsciously to integrate or disintegrate, along rigid mathematical lines, into exactly symmetrical units. The effect of these successive dichotomies is of course to limit more and more the number of women with whom a man may lawfully have sexual relations. By the division of the community into two groups or classes, he is restricted in his choice, roughly speaking, to one half of the women; by the division into four he is restricted to one fourth of the women; and by the division into eight he is restricted to one eighth. It is not of course implied that a man has now, or indeed ever

pp. 62 *sq.*; *iid.*, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 72 *sq.*; *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 155, 308 *sqq.*, 363-373.

[1] On this subject see *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 272 *sqq.*, iv. 112 *sqq.*

had, sexual relations with all the women of the group into which he is allowed to marry; but he calls all these women his wives, and while he now regularly has one or more women with whom he cohabits to the practical exclusion of others, it seems probable that this limitation has resulted from the same gradual shrinkage of the intermarrying groups which appears most conspicuously in the successive divisions of the community into two, four, and eight intermarrying classes. To put it otherwise, we may suppose that formerly the sexual relations between groups of men and women were much looser than they are now, that in fact men of one group much oftener exercised those marital rights over the women of the corresponding group which in theory they still possess, though practically they have to a great extent allowed them to fall into abeyance.

The classificatory system of relationship seems not to be affected by those divisions of the community into four and eight exogamous classes which occur in Australia.

It is important to observe that the classificatory or group system of relationship appears to be based on the first of these successive bisections, and on it alone.[1] There is no sign, so far as I know, that the system of relationship has been modified by the later subdivisions of the community into four and eight classes; and this conclusion is confirmed by the observation that, while the classificatory or group system of relationship is found diffused over a large part of the world, the system of four or eight exogamous classes has been discovered nowhere but in Australia.

The successive division of the community into two, four, and eight exogamous classes seems to have been intended to bar the marriage of various degrees of kin.

If we seek to ascertain more definitely what marriages between persons of near kin these successive subdivisions of the community were intended to bar, it will appear on examination highly probable that the first division into two exogamous classes was intended primarily to bar the marriage of brothers with sisters; that the second division into four exogamous classes was intended primarily to bar the marriage of parents with children; and that the third division into eight exogamous classes was intended primarily to bar the marriage of cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively.[2] At least these were certainly amongst the effects produced by the successive divisions,

[1] Compare Lorimer Fison, "The Classificatory System of Relationship," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895) p. 364; *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 122 *sqq.*

[2] On this and what follows, compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 271 *sqq.*, iv. 112 *sqq.*

and from the effects it is legitimate to argue back to the intentions.

To take the first of these divisions, the evidence points to the conclusion that the dual organization, or division of a community into two exogamous and intermarrying classes, was introduced for the purpose of preventing the marriage of brothers with sisters, which presumably had hitherto been lawful, though no doubt the feeling against it had been growing long before it took definite shape in the dual organization. That organization, which may perhaps be described as the first great moral reformation of which we have any record, absolutely prevented these objectionable unions for the future by the very simple expedient of assigning all the brothers and sisters of a family to the same exogamous class and prohibiting all marriages between members of the same exogamous class. Henceforth, instead of marrying their own sisters, as men had probably often, if not regularly, done before, they now exchanged them in marriage for the sisters of men who belonged to the other exogamous class: the exchange of sisters between the two exogamous and intermarrying classes became the regular mode of obtaining wives under the new dual organization of society. No doubt the sister whom a man gave in exchange for a wife was sometimes not his own sister, but his sister in the classificatory or group sense, who might sometimes be what we should call his first cousin, the daughter either of his mother's sister or of his father's brother; for these women would always belong to his own exogamous class, he would call them all sisters, and while he could not marry them, he was free to give them in exchange for wives, provided he obtained the consent of their blood relations, particularly of their own brothers, own fathers, or own mothers' brothers. But naturally a man who had sisters of his own to give away would exchange them rather than cousins or more distant relatives, since as a brother he could dispose of them without asking the leave of anybody, at all events when his father and mother's brother were dead. When the exchange of women in marriage was effected by their betrothal in infancy, it would usually be the girl's own father or own

The primary division of the community into two exogamous classes seems to have been intended to bar the marriage of brothers with sisters, which had probably been legitimate before.

Henceforth men, instead of marrying their own sisters, exchanged them in marriage for the sisters of men of the other exogamous class.

mother's brother who would arrange to give her away and to get in return a girl of the other exogamous class as a wife for his son or his nephew; for though under the classificatory system a man would apply the name of daughter to all the women of the generation below his own either in his own or in his wife's exogamous class, according as descent was traced in the male or the female line, he would naturally have more power over his own daughters or over his own sister's daughters than over women who were more distantly related to him. Hence even under the classificatory system, which extends the notions of brothers and sisters, of fathers and daughters, far beyond those limits of consanguinity within which we confine them, it would generally be the own brother or the own father who would give his sister or daughter in exchange for a girl to be his own or his son's or his sister's son's wife. But even when the exchange is regularly arranged by a girl's father or mother's brother rather than by her own brother, the resulting matches are still in effect based on an exchange of sisters; since each of the two men who gets a wife resigns a sister to be the wife of the other man.

From the exchange of sisters in marriage, which formed the pivot of the two-class system or dual organization of society, probably flowed directly the custom of cross-cousin marriage.

Thus the exchange of sisters, whether sisters in the full or in the group sense of the word, appears to have been the very pivot on which turned the great reform initiated by the dual organization of society. Instead of marrying their sisters, as they had often, perhaps regularly, done before, men now gave them away to other men, and received the sisters of these men as wives in return. But I have given reasons for thinking that the preference for the marriage of cross-cousins flowed directly from the custom of exchanging sisters in marriage. If that is so, the preference may well date from, if it did not precede, the remote time when the custom of exchange was first systematized as the fundamental base of the new organization of society in two exogamous classes. The nearness of blood between the married cousins was, perhaps, regarded at first rather as an advantage than otherwise; it continued in a mitigated form that fusion of kindred blood which had been effected in a far stronger form by the old marriage of brothers with sisters; it was a compromise between the views of the conservatives, who

preferred the old marriage with sisters, and the views of the liberals, who preferred the new marriage with cousins. But it was only the marriage of cross-cousins which the new system permitted; the marriage of ortho-cousins was barred from the very foundation of that system by the rule which placed the children of brothers in the same exogamous class, and the children of sisters in the same exogamous class, and therefore forbade the children of one brother to marry the children of another brother, and the children of one sister to marry the children of another sister. Thus the preference for some marriages of cousins and the prohibition of others are probably at least as old as the first institution of a marriage system based upon prohibited degrees of consanguinity.

On the other hand the marriage of ortho-cousins was barred from the beginning by the two-class system or dual organization.

But here a distinction must be drawn between the preference and the prohibition; for while the prohibition is perhaps not older than the dual organization, it is possible and indeed probable that the practice of cousin marriage and the preference for it long preceded the two-class system of exogamy. For doubtless it would be a mistake to imagine that the formal introduction of that system made a great and sudden break in the marriage customs of the people who adopted it; that the day before the new code became law, everybody had married his sister, and that the day after it became law, everybody married his cross-cousin instead. That is not the way in which legislative changes are effected either in savage or in civilized society. Everywhere a new law, which has been passed, not by the arbitrary fiat of a despot, but with the general consent of the people, merely expresses, defines, and prescribes a certain course of action which has long been voluntarily pursued by many individuals and which is in harmony with the general sentiments of the community. The new law simply renders obligatory and universal a practice which before had been optional and partial or even general: it converts the usage of many into a rule for all, and in doing so it punishes as a crime what till then had been only a fault or indiscretion, condemned by public opinion but not repressed by public authority. Hence, to take the particular case with which we are here concerned, we must suppose that the prohibition of the marriage of brothers with sisters, which the two-class

The preference for the marriage of cross-cousins is probably older than the two-class system of exogamy, which merely sanctioned a custom which had long been growing in favour, and forbade a custom (the marriage of brothers with sisters) which had long been falling into disfavour and disuse.

system of exogamy involves, merely followed instead of leading the general current of popular sentiment which had long been running against these close consanguineous unions. Such marriages, we may assume, had for generations excited the reprobation of the community and had been gradually falling more and more into desuetude before they were finally abolished by the dual organization. And just as, in the ages which preceded that great era in the history of society, the marriage of brothers with sisters had been steadily growing rarer and rarer, so on the other hand it is reasonable to suppose that the exchange of sisters in marriage and its natural sequence, the marriage of cross-cousins, had been becoming commoner and commoner, till at last with the institution of two-class exogamy the marriage with sisters was absolutely prohibited and the marriage with cross-cousins was raised to the preferential position which it still occupies among many races.

The view that the dual organization, or two-class system of exogamy, sprang from an aversion to the marriage of near kin, is strengthened by the rules in regard to cross-cousin marriage observed by three neighbouring Australian tribes, the Urabunna, Dieri, and Arunta.

The view that the dual organization or division of a community into two exogamous and intermarrying classes sprang from an aversion to the marriages of brothers with sisters and a deliberate attempt to prevent them, is strengthened by a consideration of the customs with regard to cousin marriages in Australia, the country where, on account of the backward state of the aborigines, the ancient dual organization survived in its fullest form down to our own time, and where consequently the early history of marriage can be studied to the best advantage. We have seen that in two tribes, the Urabunna and Dieri, who live side by side under entirely similar physical conditions and with precisely the same form of social organization, the rule as to the marriage of cousins is very different; for while the one tribe (the Urabunna) enjoins a man to marry his cross-cousin, the other tribe (the Dieri) absolutely forbids him to marry her, but enjoins him to marry his second cousin, or rather one particular kind of second cousin. In comparing this remarkable difference of usage between the two tribes, I said that the Dieri custom of prohibiting the marriages of cross-cousins was doubtless later than the Urabunna custom of encouraging them, and that it marked a step upward on the ladder of social progress. It may have occurred to some

of my readers to question that statement, and to ask whether the change may not have taken place in the opposite direction. Why, it may be asked, should not the Dieri custom of prohibiting the marriage of first cousins be the original practice, and the Urabunna custom of encouraging it be a later relaxation of the strict old rule? Why should not the Urabunna have taken a step down the ladder in the direction of encouraging consanguineous marriages, instead of the Dieri taking a step up the ladder in the direction of forbidding such marriages? I think that a very good reason can be given for holding that the Dieri rule is the later and more advanced, the Urabunna the earlier and more primitive. It is to be observed, in the first place, that the marriage of cross-cousins is not barred by the class system of the Dieri, which is identical with that of the Urabunna; the prohibition of such unions is a fresh restriction on the freedom of marriage superadded by the Dieri to the restrictions of their class system but not yet incorporated in that system. But in a large group of tribes in Central Australia, of whom the Arunta may be regarded as typical, this scruple as to the marriage of cross-cousins is carried much further, for it is actually incorporated in their system of exogamous classes, which have been multiplied to eight in number, apparently for the purpose, as I have already indicated, of preventing the marriage of cross-cousins. This purpose is effected by the division of the community into eight exogamous and intermarrying classes, combined with rules of descent which ensure that cross-cousins never fall into classes that are marriageable with each other. Now it is as certain as anything of the kind can be that the elaborate system of eight exogamous classes, with its intricate rules of descent, is later in origin than the simple two-class system and has been developed out of it through an intermediate system of four classes, which is still found in many Australian tribes. Hence if, as seems probable, this complicated system of eight exogamous classes was ingeniously devised for the special purpose of prohibiting those marriages of cross-cousins which it unquestionably prevents, we may fairly infer that the Arunta and all the other tribes, who have adopted the eight-class system, represent a further advance from con-

For the Urabunna enjoin such marriages, the Dieri forbid them, and the Arunta have devised an elaborate system of eight exogamous classes to prevent them.

sanguineous marriage than the Dieri, who, adhering to the old two-class system, are content simply to prohibit the marriage of cross-cousins without incorporating the prohibition in their exogamous system, which would have had to be completely recast to receive it. Thus in the Urabunna, the Dieri, and the Arunta, three neighbouring tribes of Central Australia, we can discern three distinct and successive stages in the evolution of the social laws discountenancing and forbidding the marriage of near kin. In the Urabunna the marriage of brothers and sisters is prevented by their class system, but the marriage of cross-cousins is left open by their system and positively encouraged by custom. In the Dieri, the marriage of cross-cousins is still left open by the class system, but is prohibited by custom. In the Arunta the marriage of cross-cousins is prohibited not only by custom but by the class system, which has been profoundly modified and elaborated in order to include the prohibition. Thus the three tribes form a series in which the successive stages of social and moral progress are clearly marked. And as the system of eight exogamous classes extends among the Australian tribes from the Arunta in the south to the Gulf of Carpentaria on the north, we may infer that the objection to the marriage of cross-cousins is strongly felt by all the aborigines over that wide area.

Thus in the Urabunna, the Dieri, and the Arunta we see three successive stages in the evolution of social laws forbidding the marriage of near kin.

Having said so much about the two-class system and the eight-class system of exogamy in Australian tribes, I may add a few words about the intermediate system of four classes, though it is not immediately connected with the marriage of cousins. As the two-class system seems to have been introduced primarily to prevent the marriage of brothers with sisters, so the four-class system seems to have been introduced primarily to prevent the marriage of parents with children.[1] The two-class system, while it was apparently directed in the first place against the marriage of brothers with sisters, incidentally prevented the marriage of a child with one parent, but not with both; it prevented the marriage of a mother with her son when descent was traced

The four-class system of exogamy, which is intermediate between the two-class system and the eight-class system in certain Australian tribes, appears to have been devised

[1] This was clearly pointed out long ago by the late Dr. A. W. Howitt, in his important paper, "Notes on the Australian Class Systems," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xii. (1883) pp. 496 *sqq*.

in the female line, because the son thus belonged to his mother's exogamous class, and therefore the two, as members of one and the same exogamous group, could not unite in marriage. But the two-class system with descent in the female line presented no obstacle to the marriage of a father with his daughter, since she belonged to her mother's class, which was the very one into which he might and must marry. On the other hand, when descent was traced in the male line, the effects were just the converse. A father was prevented from marrying his daughter, because she belonged to his own exogamous class, and the two were therefore not marriageable. But the mother was free to marry her son, since he belonged to his father's class, which was the very one into which she might and must marry. It seems probable, therefore, that cases of marriage between parents and children, in the one form or the other, may have occurred not infrequently even after the introduction of the two-class system, which, whether combined with male or with female descent of the class, could only bar one half of such incestuous unions. The introduction of the four-class system barred all such marriages. The fundamental defect of the two-class system was that by always placing children in the exogamous class into which one of the parents was bound to marry, it left the door open to marriage either of a father with his daughter or of a mother with her son, according as descent of the class was reckoned in the female or in the male line. This door to incest the four-class system closed neatly and effectively by ordaining that children should never belong to the class either of their father or of their mother, but that they should always belong to a class into which neither their father nor their mother might marry. Henceforward, so long as the class laws were observed, incest between parents and children, either in the one form or in the other, was rendered impossible.

for the purpose of completely preventing the marriage of parents with children, which had been only partially prevented by the two-class system.

But the four-class system, while it barred all marriages between parents and children, did not bar the marriage of cross-cousins. Hence to stop that form of union, to which the growing scruple as to the marriage of near kin created a serious objection, it was necessary to subdivide the class system still further. The result was the creation of the eight-class system, the most elaborate form of social organiza-

But the four-class system did not bar the marriage of cross-cousins; to effect that purpose the eight-class system was created in some tribes.

tion known in aboriginal Australia and, perhaps, in the world. The whole complicated structure was produced, we can hardly doubt, by a series of successive divisions and subdivisions into two, four, and eight exogamous classes, with rules of descent of increasing intricacy, in order to meet the growing demands of popular opinion by suppressing, one after another, forms of marriage which, in the earlier stages, had been allowed or even expressly encouraged and enjoined. In its higher developments of the four-class and eight-class systems this remarkable institution seems to be, as I have said, peculiar to aboriginal Australia; at least it has not so far been discovered elsewhere in any part of the world. On the other hand the comparatively simple dual organization or two-class system has probably, as we saw, prevailed over at least half the globe.

If the dual organization was the source of the systematic distinction between cross-cousins and ortho-cousins in respect of marriage, we should expect to find traces of it, in the form either of totemic exogamy or of the classificatory system, wherever that distion is recognized. The facts conform to this expectation.

From the foregoing discussion we conclude that wherever totemic exogamy and the classificatory or group system of relationship are found, either separately or in conjunction, they point to the former existence of the dual organization or two-class system of exogamy in the people who possess one or both of these institutions. But the dual organization, if I am right, was the source both of the systematic preference for the marriage of cross-cousins and of the systematic prohibition of the marriage of ortho-cousins. Hence wherever the dual organization exists or has formerly existed, we may expect to find the preference for the marriage of cross-cousins and the prohibition of the marriage of ortho-cousins. At the beginning of our inquiry we mapped out roughly the geographical and racial area in which such marriages are preferred or prohibited. It remains to compare that area with the area in which, to judge from the presence either of totemic exogamy or of the classificatory system of relationship, the dual organization may be supposed to have formerly prevailed. If the area of cousin marriage should be found to coincide more or less closely with the area of the dual organization, it will furnish a strong additional reason for believing that the two institutions are vitally connected. Accordingly I shall briefly compare the two areas; and to anticipate the result of the comparison I may say that, so far as the imperfect evidence at our disposal permits us to judge, the two areas appear to coincide exactly.

Cousin marriage, totemic exogamy, and the classificatory system among the Dravidians of India.

In the first place we found the marriage of cross-cousins regularly favoured, and the marriage of ortho-cousins regularly prohibited among the indigenous races of Southern and Central India, particularly among the peoples of the Dravidian stock. Now the Dravidians are in possession of a complete and typical system of the classificatory or group system of relationship;[1] and totemism, in its ordinary exogamous form, is recorded of so many of their tribes and castes[2] that it may safely be regarded as characteristic of the race. Here, then, the areas of cousin marriage and of the dual organization, as attested both by totemism and by the classificatory system of relationship, absolutely coincide.

Cousin marriage, totemic exogamy, and the classificatory system among races of Asia and America.

Further, we saw that the marriage of cross-cousins is favoured above all other forms of marriage by the Singhalese and Veddas of Ceylon, and by the Todas of Southern India,[3] and all these three peoples possess the classificatory or group system of relationship, though not totemism.[4] Again, we have seen that the marriage of cross-cousins is allowed, or even preferred, among some of the Mongoloid tribes of Assam, such as the Mikirs, the Garos, and the Khasis. Of these tribes the Khasis and the Garos exhibit some traces of totemism,[5] and the Mikirs show some traces of the classificatory or group system of relationship.[6] But if one of these tribes possesses the classificatory or group system of relationship, it is probable that all of them do so, though demonstration on this important point is still lacking.[7] Again, we have

[1] L. H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City, 1871), pp. 385 *sqq.* (*Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, No. 218); *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 330 *sqq.*

[2] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 218 *sqq.* More evidence is to be found in the late R. V. Russell's valuable *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), which has provided us with much evidence as to the prevalence of cousin marriage among the same tribes (above, pp. 120 *sqq.*).

[3] Above, pp. 102, 103.

[4] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 266 *sqq.* (Todas), 333 *sq.* (Singhalese); W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 483-494; C. G. Seligmann and B. Seligmann, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 63 *sqq.*

[5] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 321 *sq.*, 323 *sq.*

[6] *The Mikirs*, from the papers of the late Edward Stack, edited by Sir Charles Lyall (London, 1908), pp. 20 *sq.* Among the traces are separate names for elder brother and younger brother, for elder sister and younger sister. The same term (*ōsa*) is applied to a sister's son and a son-in-law, which points to the popularity of marriages between cross-cousins.

[7] In order to ascertain the systems of relationship among the hill tribes of Assam, Sir Charles Lyall was so good as to write for me to Colonel P. R. T. Gurdon, Commissioner of the

seen that the marriage of cousins is very common among the Burmese and almost compulsory among the Karens.[1] Now both these peoples possess the classificatory or group system of relationship,[2] though not totemism. Further, we found that the marriage of cousins, particularly of cross-cousins, flourishes, or has flourished, among the tribes of North-Eastern Asia, such as the Gilyaks, Kamchadales, Chukchee, and Koryaks;[3] and among these tribes the classificatory or group system of relationship appears to be universally prevalent.[4] Among the aboriginal races of North America, both of the Eskimo and of the Indian stock, we found some evidence of the custom of cousin marriage, but I gave reasons for thinking that the custom has probably been much commoner among these peoples than appears from the very scanty information we possess on the subject.[5] Now both the Eskimo and the Indians possess the classificatory or group system of relationship, and among the Indians totemism is very general, though not universal.[6]

Cousin marriage, totemism, and the classificatory system in Africa.

In Africa we found the custom of marriage between first or second cousins widely spread among the black races both of the Bantu and of the true negro stock. Now among Bantu tribes at the present time both totemism and the classificatory or group system of relationship are so prevalent

---

Assam Valley Districts, who promptly instituted inquiries accordingly. As a result the terms of relationship in use among many of the tribes have been recorded and will soon, I hope, be published. In the meantime Colonel Gurdon has generously placed his manuscript collections in my hands, with permission to use them. From a cursory inspection I gather some indications of the classificatory system of relationship in several of the tribes. Thus there are distinct terms for elder and younger brother, and for elder and younger sister in the Khasi, Garo, Synteng, and Kachari languages, as well as in the Mikir; and a father's elder and younger brothers are called great fathers and little fathers respectively in the Khasi, Synteng, and Kuki languages. In the Kuki language the terms for these relatives are *Bara Bap* and *Chuta Bap*.

[1] Above, pp. 135 *sqq*.

[2] Lewis H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City, 1871), pp. 517 *sqq*.

[3] Above, pp. 138 *sqq*.

[4] Leo Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowánian System and the nations of North-East Asia," pp. 328 *sqq*. (reprinted from the *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Congress of Americanists*).

[5] Above, pp. 140 *sqq*.

[6] As to totemism and the classificatory or group system of relationship among the Indians of North America, see *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 1 *sqq*. As to the American Indian system of relationship, see Lewis H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*, pp. 131 *sqq*.; as to the Eskimo system of relationship, see *id*., pp. 275 *sqq*.

that they may safely be regarded as characteristic of the Bantu family.[1] Among the true negroes totemism is very common, but there is very little evidence that any of them have the classificatory or group system of relationship.[2]

Cousin marriage, totemism, and the classificatory system in the Indian Archipelago, Melanesia, Polynesia, and Australia.

Again, we found the marriage of cross-cousins permitted or enjoined in various parts of Indonesia. One of the peoples who particularly encourage that form of marriage are the Bataks of Sumatra; and they certainly have totemism, and apparently the classificatory or group system of relationship also.[3] Traces more or less clear of the same two institu-

[1] For the evidence, see *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 354 *sqq.* The evidence for the prevalence of totemism among the Bantus could now be considerably increased. See Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe* (Neuchâtel, 1912–1913), i. 335 *sq.*; H. S. Stannus, "Notes on some tribes of British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 307 *sq.*; J. A. Chisholm, "Notes on the manners and customs of the Winamwanga and Wiwa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. xxxvi. (July 1910) pp. 383 *sq.*; C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia* (London, 1911), pp. 93 *sqq.*, 172 *sq.*; Mgr. Lechaptois, *Aux Rives du Tanganika* (Algiers, 1913), pp. 131 *sqq.*; H. Rehse, *Kiziba, Land und Leute* (Stuttgart, 1910), pp. 4-7; H. Claus, *Die Wagogo* (Leipsic and Berlin, 1911), pp. 48 *sq.* (*Baessler-Archiv*); Otto Dempwolff, "Beiträge zur Volksbeschreibung der Hehe," *Baessler-Archiv*, iv. (1914) pp. 100 *sqq.*; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba* (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 4 *sqq.*, 102, 157, 161, 170; M. W. H. Beech, *The Suk, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1911), p. 5; A. C. Champion, "The Atharaka," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlii. (1912) pp. 88 *sq.*; Hon. Kenneth R. Dundas, "The Wawanga and other tribes of the Elgon District, British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 30 *sq.*, 59 *sqq.*; John Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 27 *sqq.*, 116 *sq.*, 148, 204 *sqq.*, 261 *sq.*; M. A. Condon, "Contributions to the Ethnography of the Basoga-Batamba, Uganda Protectorate," *Anthropos*, vi. (1911) pp. 380 *sq.*; Rev. J. H. Weeks, "Notes on the Bangala of the Upper Congo River," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 365 *sq.*; *id.*, *Among Congo Cannibals* (London, 1913), pp. 131 *sq.*, 294 *sqq.*; H. Trilles, *Le Totémisme chez les Fân* (Münster-i.-W., 1912). For further evidence of the prevalence of the classificatory system of relationship among Bantu tribes, see Rev. Herbert Barnes, *Nyanja-English Vocabulary* (London, 1902), pp. 86 *sq.*; Otto Dempwolff, "Beiträge zur Volksbeschreibung der Hehe," *Baessler-Archiv*, iv. (1914) pp. 103 *sq.*; John H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo* (London, 1914), pp. 306 *sq.*; John Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, pp. 32 *sqq.*, 118, 273 *sq.*, 292 *sq.*

[2] As to totemism among the negroes, see *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 543 *sqq.* For more evidence, see H. Bazin, "Les Bambara et leur langue," *Anthropos*, i. (1906) p. 688; J. Brun, "Le Totémisme chez quelques peuples du Soudan Occidental," *Anthropos*, v. (1910) pp. 843-869; Fr. Wolf, "Totemismus, soziale Gliederung und Rechtspflege bei einigen Stämmen Togos (Westafrika)," *Anthropos*, vi. (1911) pp. 449-462; A. J. N. Tremearne, *The Ban of the Bori* (London, N.D.), pp. 32 *sqq.* For traces of the classificatory or group system of relationship among the negroes, see *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 575 *sq.*

[3] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 185 *sqq.*

tions meet us in other parts of Sumatra and elsewhere in the Indian Archipelago.[1] Further, we saw that in various parts of Melanesia, including Fiji, cross-cousins are allowed or even expected to marry each other. Now throughout Melanesia the classificatory or group system of relationship appears to be universally prevalent; the system is known to flourish in a very characteristic form in Fiji, and traces more or less distinct of totemism have been discovered in Fiji and other Melanesian islands.[2] In Polynesia, on the other hand, we saw that the marriage of all first cousins is generally prohibited, and only in very exceptional cases permitted. Yet, when we consider the example of Australia, where the marriage of cross-cousins is encouraged by some tribes and absolutely forbidden by others, we may reasonably conjecture that among the Polynesians also the marriage of cross-cousins was formerly regarded as very suitable, and that it was only barred at a later time in consequence of that growing aversion to consanguineous marriages which is so clearly traceable among the aborigines of Australia. With this hypothesis it is entirely consistent that the classificatory or group system of relationship appears to be universally prevalent in Polynesia, and that more or less distinct traces of totemism can be detected among some branches of the widely scattered Polynesian race, particularly among the Samoans.[3] Lastly, among the Australian aborigines, some of whom encourage

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 190 *sqq.* As to the classificatory or group system of relationship in Indonesia, see F. D. E. van Ossenbruggen's note in G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), i. 141 note [1].

[2] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 63 *sqq.* For more evidence of totemism in Melanesia, see R. Thurnwald, "Im Bismarckarchipel und auf den Salomo-Inseln," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xlii. (1910) p. 124; *id.*, *Forschungen auf den Salomo-Inseln und dem Bismarckarchipel*, iii. (Berlin, 1912) pp. 61 *sq.*; C. E. Fox and F. H. Drew, "Beliefs and Tales of San Cristoval (Solomon Islands)," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlv. (1915) pp. 132 *sq.*, 161 *sqq.*; R. Parkinson, "Totemism in Melanesia," *Report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Adelaide, 1907*, pp. 209 *sqq.*; Rev. W. E. Bromilow, "Some Manners and Customs of the Dobuans of South-East Papua," *Report of the Twelfth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Brisbane, 1909*, p. 475; George Brown, D.D., *Melanesians and Polynesians* (London, 1910), pp. 27 *sqq.*; W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1914), ii. 75 *sqq.* As to the classificatory or group system of relationship in Melanesia, see further, W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 9 *sqq.*, 173 *sqq.*

[3] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 151 *sqq.*

and others forbid the marriage of cross-cousins, the institutions of totemism and the classificatory or group system of relationship appear to have been universally prevalent.[1]

Thus the preference for cross-cousin marriage and the prohibition of ortho-cousin marriage seem to flow directly from the dual organization, with which, or with traces of which, they are everywhere associated.

Thus, finding the preference for cross-cousin marriage and the prohibition of ortho-cousin marriage almost everywhere associated either with totemic exogamy, or with the classificatory system of relationship, or with both of them together, we may infer with some probability that the three institutions are vitally connected with each other; and if I am right in thinking that totemic exogamy and the classificatory system of relationship flow directly from the organization of society in two exogamous classes,[2] it will follow that the preference for cross-cousin marriage and the prohibition of ortho-cousin marriage are also vitally connected with the dual organization. What the exact nature of that connexion was, I have endeavoured to indicate. If I am right, the preference for the marriage of cross-cousins was a direct consequence of that interchange of sisters in marriage which formed the corner-stone of the dual organization of society in two exogamous and intermarrying classes; and the interchange, first of sisters and afterwards of cross-cousins in marriage, was prompted by the simplest of economic motives, the need of bartering one woman for another, since in the general poverty characteristic of low savagery a man had practically no other lawful mode of obtaining a wife. Finally, the marriage of ortho-cousins, who, regarded from the purely economic point of view, do not differ at all from cross-cousins, was barred by the dual organization from the very moment of its institution, because under that organization all such cousins necessarily fall into the same exogamous class, and are, therefore, prohibited from marrying each other.

The customs passed in review exhibit a growing aversion to the marriage of near kin.

The general cause which I have assumed for the successive changes in marriage customs which we have now passed under review is a growing aversion to the marriage of persons nearly related to each other by blood. Into the

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 175 *sqq.*

[2] I would ask the reader to observe that it is only totemic exogamy, and not totemism itself, which I believe to be a direct consequence of the dual organization. In my view, totemism existed before, probably long before, the introduction of exogamy in the form of the two-class system. See *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 162 *sqq.*, 251 *sq.*, 256 *sqq.*, iv. 8 *sq.*, 74 *sq.*, 127 *sqq.*

origin of that aversion I shall not here inquire; the problem is one of the darkest and most difficult in the whole history of society. I shall merely point out that, so far as the custom of cousin marriage is concerned, this explanation is confirmed by the theory and practice of some of the peoples who object to such unions. Thus we have seen that several Australian tribes forbid the marriage of certain cousins for the express reason that these relatives are "too near" in flesh to marry.[1] Still more striking is the evidence furnished by some African tribes which, as we saw, expiate the marriage of certain cousins by severing the entrails of a sacrificial victim, in the belief that thereby they sever the tie of blood between the cousins.[2] Such practices prove that these people conceive the relationship between the cousins in the most concrete form as a bond of actual flesh and blood, which must be cut before the two persons may lawfully cohabit as husband and wife.

§ 14. *An alternative Explanation of Cross-Cousin Marriage*

In some places the custom of the cross-cousin marriage may have resulted from causes other than the exchange of sisters as wives.

Thus far we have found what seems to be a simple and probable explanation of cross-cousin marriage in the custom of exchanging sisters as wives. But in this as in all inquiries into the origin of institutions we must bear in mind that the simplest and most obvious explanations are by no means always the truest; the evolution of custom and belief has often been extremely complex, and we may fall into serious error if we seek to unravel the tangled skein by a single clue. In particular, it is well to remember that customs which appear or are really alike may have had very different origins, since dissimilar causes may and often do produce similar effects. Hence it does not follow that, because the explanation which I have suggested of cross-cousin marriage is simple, it is necessarily true, nor even if it is true for some places, does it follow that it is true for all. We should be prepared to admit, in fact, that people may have arrived at the custom of marrying their cross-cousins by quite other roads than by the exchange of sisters.

One such possible road has been pointed out by Dr.

[1] Above, pp. 192 *sq.*

[2] See above, pp. 162 *sq.*, 165.

W. H. R. Rivers for Melanesia, in some parts of which, as we saw, the custom of cross-cousin marriage is much favoured.[1] The authority with which Dr. Rivers writes not only on Melanesia but on all questions of primitive marriage and relationship entitles his opinion to the most respectful consideration. He was led to his explanation of cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia by an examination of certain anomalous terms of relationship which point, with great probability, to correspondingly anomalous forms of marriage; since we have good reason for believing that the classificatory system of relationship, to which the Melanesian systems conform, reflects accurately a system of marriage, whether present or past. The anomalous forms of marriage thus indicated for Melanesia are marriage with a granddaughter, marriage with a grandmother, and marriage with the wife of a mother's brother.[2] In speaking of marriage with a grandmother or a granddaughter we must remember that these terms are here used in the classificatory or group sense, and therefore do not necessarily denote the blood relations whom we should designate by them. Hence, the woman whom a man calls his granddaughter and whom he marries, need not be his actual granddaughter; she may be, for example, his brother's granddaughter, in other words, his own grandniece. Similarly, the woman whom a man calls his grandmother and whom he marries, need not be his actual grandmother; she may be, for example, another wife of his grandfather, in other words, his own step-grandmother.

A different theory of the origin of cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia has been suggested by Dr. Rivers on the ground of certain anomalous forms of marriages which exist in that region or are traceable in the terms of relationship.

Nor are we left to infer the former prevalence of these anomalous marriages in Melanesia merely from the corresponding terms of relationship; strange as such unions appear to us, they are said to survive to some extent in

Marriage with a grandmother, a granddaughter, and a mother's brother's wife in Melanesia.

[1] Above, pp. 177 *sqq.*

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1914), i. 48, 185, 196 *sqq.*, ii. 38, 46 *sqq.*, 104, 326; *id.* "Melanesian Gerontocracy," *Man*, xv. (1915) pp. 145-147. To be exact, the marriage with a granddaughter is the marriage with a daughter's daughter, not with a son's daughter; and the marriage with a grandmother is the marriage with a father's mother, not with a mother's mother. For marriage with either a son's daughter or with a mother's mother is excluded by the two-class system of exogamy with female descent, which at present prevails in some parts of Melanesia, and probably prevailed there universally at the time when these marriages were in vogue. Under that system a son's daughter and a mother's mother always belong to a man's own exogamous class, and therefore he is prohibited from marrying them.

popular custom or at all events tradition. For example, Dr. Rivers was definitely told that in the island of Pentecost, one of the New Hebrides, a man may and sometimes does marry the granddaughter of his brother, who would be his own granddaughter in the classificatory sense of the term, though not in ours.[1] Again, in several parts of Melanesia, particularly in the islands of Ambrym and Malo and at least two places in Espiritu Santo, Dr. Rivers found that a man marries the widow of his father's father, whom under the classificatory system of relationship he calls his grandmother, whether she is his actual grandmother or not.[2] Finally, the custom of marriage with the widow of a mother's brother is still observed in various parts of Melanesia, such as the Banks' Islands, Hiw (Torres Islands), and several of the New Hebrides, including Pentecost, Sandwich Island (Efate), and Espiritu Santo; indeed, Dr. Rivers was informed that in more than one of these places men give their wives to their sisters' sons in their lifetime, in other words, a man sometimes marries his mother's brother's wife in the lifetime of his maternal uncle.[3] Thus there is good ground for believing that marriages with a granddaughter, a grandmother, and the wife of a maternal uncle either are or were formerly customary in some parts of Melanesia, though we must remember that in saying so we use the terms of relationship in the wide classificatory or group sense, which includes many persons not really related by blood.

Dr. Rivers's suggested explanations of these anomalous marriages.

To explain these curious forms of marriage Dr. Rivers suggests the following hypothesis. He supposes that in Melanesia, as in Australia, old men formerly contrived to appropriate the women to a large extent, so that young men had often to go without wives or to put up with the widows or cast-off wives of their elders. The case is indeed not purely hypothetical; it is said to be a regular feature of

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, i. 199, 203 *sq.* The statement was made to Dr. Rivers by John Pantutun, a native of the Banks Islands, who had lived for some time in Pentecost. But it was not confirmed by the Rev. H. N. Drummond, who inquired into the subject for Dr. Rivers on the spot.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, "Melanesian Gerontocracy," *Man*, xv. (1915) p. 146.

[3] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, i. 48, 185, 206; *id.* "Melanesian Gerontocracy," *Man*, xv. (1915) p. 146.

society in many parts of the New Hebrides, where all young women capable of work are bought up by the old men, and a young man, if he marries at all, must mate with an old widow.[1] In such a state of things, his partiality for female society, especially for the society of young women, might often lead an old man to marry his own granddaughter or his brother's granddaughter, instead of bestowing her hand on a youthful lover. This would explain the first of the anomalous forms of Melanesian marriage, namely, the marriage of a man with his granddaughter or with a woman whom under the classificatory system of relationship he would call his granddaughter. But sometimes, we may suppose, an old man so far yielded to the promptings of nature or to the urgent solicitations of his grandson as to resign one of his own numerous wives to the young man; in fact, he might exchange one of his wives for the young man's sister. Thus the old man would be provided with a young wife, and the young man with an old one, as often happens in savage society. This would explain the second of the anomalous forms of marriage in Melanesia, namely, the marriage of a man with his grandmother, or at all events with an old woman whom he called his grandmother in the classificatory sense of the word. Lastly, since in primitive society a man stands in a specially close relationship to his sister's son, who indeed in some parts of Melanesia enjoys extraordinary privileges as against his maternal uncle, it would be natural for the uncle to pass on one of his superfluous wives to his nephew, the son of his sister, as indeed is said to be done in some parts of the New Hebrides to this day. The custom, still observed in some parts of Melanesia, of marrying the widow of a mother's brother would thus be derived from an older custom of marrying a maternal uncle's wife in the lifetime of the uncle. This would explain the third of the anomalous forms of marriage in Melanesia, namely, the marriage of a man with the wife of his mother's brother.[2]

It will be noticed that according to this theory, while the

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, "Melanesian Gerontocracy," *Man*, xv. (1915) p. 147, referring to Felix Speiser, *Südsee, Urwald, Kannibalen* (Leipsic, 1913), pp. 68, 81, 216.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 46 *sqq.*

Why a Melanesian father may not transfer his wives to his sons or to his daughter's sons.

obliging old man accommodates his grandson or his sister's son with one of his cast-off wives, he makes no similar provision for his own son. A sufficient reason for the omission is that under the two-class system of exogamy with female descent, which at one time was probably universal in Melanesia, a man belongs to the same exogamous class as his mother and all the other wives of his father; hence by the fundamental law of exogamy, which prohibits marriage between members of the same exogamous class, the father is prohibited from passing on any of these women to his son to be his wife. On the other hand, under the same system, a son's son always belongs to the same class as his paternal grandfather; hence the two take their wives from the same class, and, so far as the law of exogamy is concerned, there is no objection to a grandfather bestowing one of his wives on his son's son. But he could not bestow her on his daughter's son, since that young man would belong to the same exogamous class as his maternal grandmother and would therefore be debarred from the privilege of marrying the old lady or any other wife of his maternal grandfather. That is why in Melanesia a man might transfer his wives to his son's sons or to his sister's sons, but not to his own sons or to his daughter's sons.

Dr. Rivers would deduce cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia from marriage with a mother's brother's wife.

It is from the third of these anomalous marriages, namely, from the marriage with the wife of the mother's brother, that Dr. Rivers proposes to deduce the custom of cross-cousin marriage in Melanesia. He supposes that in course of time, when a man's relationship to his own children was generally recognized, and he had acquired the right of disposing of his daughters in marriage, it occurred to him that instead of passing on one of his own wives to his sister's son he might give one of his daughters to that young man, the damsel's cross-cousin. If the same idea occurred to many men and were commonly acted upon, a custom of cross-cousin marriage would be the result. Once started, the new custom would probably soon grow popular, since, compared with the preceding practice, it offered an attraction both to uncle and nephew; the uncle was not obliged to sacrifice any of his wives, and the nephew secured a young wife instead of an old one.[1]

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 57 *sqq.*, 111 *sqq.*, 121 *sqq.*, 326 *sqq.*

It cannot be denied that, given the conditions of society as they are or may be inferred to have formerly been in Melanesia, this ingenious hypothesis accounts for the origin of cousin marriage in a plausible manner; the facts and the inferences dovetail neatly into each other, and their correspondence so far lends a degree of probability to the theory. The evolution of cousin marriage may have followed this course in Melanesia, and Dr. Rivers is careful to point out that his speculations only apply to the institutions of Oceania, which includes Melanesia and Polynesia; he leaves entirely open the question of the origin of cross-cousin marriage elsewhere, adding that in other parts of the world the custom may have originated in some simpler fashion than that which is suggested by his theory.[1] Regarded as a general explanation of cross-cousin marriage the theory would be open to the objections, first, that it assumes as its basis an anomalous form of marriage (the marriage with the mother's brother's wife) which appears to have been rare and exceptional in other parts of the world,[2] and which is therefore unlikely to have been the source of a custom so common

Objections to this theory as a general explanation of cross-cousin marriage.

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 123.

[2] As to marriage with the mother's brother's widow among the Garos, see below, pp. 252 *sqq.* Among the tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia "there is one method of allotment of wives which is, so far as I am aware, peculiar to this nation of tribes. I have not met with it in any of the Central tribes, nor does it seem to have been noted elsewhere in Australia. This method consists in the allotment to a man of a woman who belongs to the generation immediately senior to himself, and who stands to him in the relationship of *Koiyu*, that is, father's wife, or *Ngaila*, mother's brother's wife. The Koiyu women, of course, include his own actual mother, but that particular woman may not be allotted to him" (Sir Baldwin Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia*, London, 1914, p. 47). However, this allotment is not made, as in the case supposed by Dr. Rivers, by the woman's husband, but always by her mother's brothers (*op. cit.* p. 51). Thus the two cases are not really parallel, since in the Australian case there is no question of a man voluntarily resigning his wife to his sister's son. There are traces of marriage with the mother's brother's wife among the Baronga and Baganda of Africa, and among the Pawnees, Minnetarees, and Choctaws of North America. Among the Baronga a man seems still to possess marital rights over his mother's brother's wife; in the other tribes the traces of such rights survive only in the terms of the classificatory system. See *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 387, 510 *sq.*, iii. 149, 175 *sq.*; and as to the American evidence, W. H. R. Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organization* (London, 1914), pp. 52 *sq.* In *Totemism and Exogamy* (ii. 511) I remarked that the terms for cousins in the Mota form of the classificatory system suggest the exercise of marital rights by a man over his mother's brother's wife, and that the suggestion is confirmed by the extraordinary privileges which in Fiji a man enjoys as against his mother's brother.

and 'widespread as the marriage of cross-cousins; second, that it implies a combination of conditions' which we can hardly suppose to have been independently repeated in many distant lands; and, third, that it assumes the marriage of cross-cousins to have originated at a comparatively late time when the power of a father to dispose of his daughters had been fully established, whereas there is a good deal to suggest, as I have attempted to show, that the marriage of cross-cousins is exceedingly old, dating perhaps from a time even before the establishment of the dual organization or system of two exogamous and intermarrying classes.

Marriage with the mother's brother's wife regularly occurs among the Garos, but there it appears to be the effect rather than the cause of cross-cousin marriage.

Be that as it may, there appears to be some ground for thinking that elsewhere than in Melanesia marriage with the mother's brother's wife, which Dr. Rivers regards as the source of the cross-cousin marriage, has been rather the consequence than the cause of that institution. We have seen that the cross-cousin marriage is in vogue among the Garos of Assam, a man being regularly expected to marry the daughter of his mother's brother.[1] If he does so, he takes up his abode with his parents-in-law, and on the death of his father-in-law he is obliged to marry his widowed mother-in-law, his mother's brother's wife, who should also be his paternal aunt; since among the Garos it is not only allowed but expected that men should exchange their sisters in marriage, and a necessary effect of this exchange is, as we saw,[2] that a man's paternal aunt is at the same time the wife of his mother's brother. Hence in this tribe a man is often the husband simultaneously of his mother's brother's wife and of her daughter, his cross-cousin; but he marries his cross-cousin first and her mother afterwards as a consequence of his previous marriage with her daughter. In this case, therefore, marriage with the mother's brother's wife is not the cause but the effect of marriage with the cross-cousin. And the motive for marrying the mother's brother's wife, who is at the same time the mother-in-law, is extremely simple. It appears to be neither more nor less than a wish to enjoy the old lady's property, which can only be got by marrying her. Among the Garos mother-kin prevails in one of its most typical forms, and under it no man can legally inherit

[1] See above, pp. 132 *sq.*

[2] Above, p. 208.

property under any circumstances whatever. All property passes by inheritance from women to women; but by a merciful dispensation of Providence, which tempers the wind to the shorn ram, a husband is permitted to enjoy, though he cannot own, the family estate which, in the eye of the law, belongs to his wife alone. Accordingly, when the husband dies, the enjoyment, though not the legal ownership, of the estate, passes to the man who is so fortunate as to marry the widow, and under Garo law the lucky man is her son-in-law, who is at the same time the son of her late husband's sister and succeeds to her hand and to the enjoyment of her property in virtue of his capacity of sister's son to the deceased; since under the system of mother-kin a man's successor is not his own son but the son of his sister. Only it is to be observed that in this system of mother-kin pure and simple the sister's son is not, properly speaking, the heir of his maternal uncle, because the uncle, as a mere man, had nothing to leave, and the nephew, as a mere man, had therefore nothing to inherit. That is why under Garo law a man is regularly reduced to the painful necessity either of marrying his mother-in-law or of forfeiting the enjoyment of the estate. Most men apparently submit to their fate and marry their mothers-in-law; hence it is common enough to see a young Garo introducing as his wife a woman who is old enough to be his mother, and is in fact his mother-in-law and his aunt, both in one. Occasionally, however, a young man seems to think that the game is not worth the candle and positively refuses to unite with his mother-in-law in holy matrimony. In that case there is no help for it but he must lose the estate. We read, for example, of a case in which a recalcitrant son-in-law flatly declined to lead his aged mother-in-law to the altar, whereupon the old lady in a huff bestowed not only her own hand but that of her daughter to boot on another man, thus depriving her ungallant son-in-law of an estate and two wives at one fell swoop. In vain the unfortunate man appealed to the law to award him the goods, if not the ladies; the verdict ran that, having failed to do his duty by his mother-in-law, he must abide by the consequences.[1]

[1] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 63; (Sir) W. W. Hunter, *Statistical Account of Assam* (London, 1879), ii. 154; *Census of*

The simple economic motive at the base of the cross-cousin marriage comes out very clearly in Garo customary law.

Thus among the Garos marriage with a mother's brother's widow appears to be a simple consequence of previous marriage with her daughter; in other words, it is the effect, not the cause of the cross-cousin marriage, and is determined by the purely economic, not to say mercenary, motive of obtaining those material advantages which are inseparably attached to the hand of the widow. Hence a study of Garo customary law seems peculiarly well fitted to explain the origin and meaning of cross-cousin marriage; for it enjoins, first, the exchange of sisters in marriage, second, the marriage of a man with his cross-cousin, the daughter of his mother's brother, and, third, marriage with the widow of the mother's brother. If I am right, these three customs are related to each other in a chain of cause and effect. The exchange of sisters in marriage produced as its natural consequence the marriage of cross-cousins; and the marriage of cross-cousins in its turn produced by a natural consequence the marriage with the mother's brother's widow. All three customs arose simply and naturally through economic motives. Men exchanged their sisters in marriage because that was the cheapest way of getting a wife; men married their cross-cousins for a similar reason; and men married their widowed mothers-in-law because that was the only way of enjoying the old ladies' property.

Distinction between marrying the mother's brother's wife before and after the death of the maternal uncle.

However, while this theory suggests an adequate reason for a man's marriage with the widow of his mother's brother, it does not account for a practice of marrying her in the uncle's lifetime. Accordingly, if that practice has really been widespread, a different explanation of it must be looked for, and the one proposed by Dr. Rivers may possibly be correct. Still I would remark, first, that the evidence for the actual observance of such a custom is both scanty and uncertain, amounting indeed to hardly more than hearsay; and, second, that the inference to be drawn from certain classificatory terms for cousins,[1] which do unques-

India, 1891, Assam, by (Sir) E. A. Gait, vol. i. *Report* (Shillong, 1892), p. 229; Major A. Playfair, *The Garos* (London, 1909), pp. 68, 72 *sq.* According to Sir E. A. Gait, it is the husband of the *youngest* daughter who is bound to marry his widowed mother-in-law, and this is natural enough, since it is the *youngest* daughter who is her mother's heir among the Garos. See vol. i. pp. 464 *sq.*

[1] See above, p. 251 note [2].

tionably point to marriage, or at all events to sexual relations, of a man with his mother's brother's wife, might perhaps be equally valid if that marriage or those relations did not take place till after the death of the mother's brother.

§ 15. *Cousin Marriage among the Arabs*

Among some people there is a preference for marriage with an ortho-cousin, the daughter of a father's brother.

Thus far we have found that many peoples in many parts of the world draw a sharp distinction between the two classes of cousins which we have called cross-cousins and ortho-cousins respectively, and that among the peoples who thus differentiate between cousins an immense majority allows or even enjoins marriage between cross-cousins, the children of a brother and of a sister respectively, but forbids marriage between ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters. But in the course of our inquiry a few exceptions to this general rule have been met with. We have seen that among the Mohammedans of India marriage between the children of two brothers or of two sisters, as well as between the children of a brother and of a sister, respectively, is considered very suitable;[1] that in some Bantu tribes of South Africa marriage between the children of two brothers, in other words, the marriage of a man with the daughter of his father's brother, is not only allowed but preferred;[2] that in other Bantu tribes the marriage with such a cousin is permitted on condition that husband and wife have different totems;[3] and that in Madagascar marriage between cousins, the children of brothers, is exceedingly common and is looked upon as the most proper form of connubial union.[4]

Preference for marriage with an ortho-cousin, the daughter of a father's brother, among the Arabs.

Among the Arabs a similar preference for marriage with the daughter of the father's brother seems to be strong, general, and ancient. It is said to be one of the most widespread rules of Arabian law that a man has the first claim to the hand of his father's brother's daughter. In modern Arabian custom a father cannot give his daughter to another if his brother's son asks for her, and her cousin, the son of her father's brother, can have her cheaper than any other wife.[5]

[1] Above, p. 131.
[2] Above, p. 151.
[3] Above, p. 152.
[4] Above, p. 158.
[5] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, New Edition (London, 1903), p. 163. Compare J. Wellhausen, "Die Ehe bei den Arabern," *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der*

"A cousin (the daughter of a paternal uncle) is often chosen as a wife, on account of the tie of blood, which is likely to attach her more strongly to her husband; or on account of an affection conceived in early years;"[1] and "an Arab who is married to his cousin, generally calls her by this appellation rather than that of wife, as the tie of blood is, to him, in every respect, stronger than that of matrimony."[2] Indeed, so general is the custom of marriage with the daughter of the father's brother among the Arabs that a man will apply the name of "father's brother" (*'amm*) to his father-in-law, even when his father-in-law is no kinsman of his, and he will apply the term "father's brother's daughter" (*bint-'amm*) to his beloved, even when she is not his cousin at all.[3] Speaking of the Bedouins of El-Hejaz, the region of western Arabia which includes the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, Burton observes that "here no evil results are anticipated from the union of first cousins, and the experience of ages and of a nation may be trusted. Every Bedouin has a right to marry his father's brother's daughter before she is given to a stranger; hence 'cousin (*bint Amm*) in polite phrase signifies a wife.'"[4] "All Arabian Bedouins," says Burckhardt, "acknowledge the first cousin's prior right to a girl; whose father cannot refuse to bestow her on him in marriage, should he pay a reasonable price; and that price is always something less than would be demanded from a stranger. The Arabs of Sinai, however, sometimes marry their daughters to strangers in the absence of the cousins. This happened to a guide whom I had taken from Suez. . . . To prevent similar occurrences, a cousin, if he be determined to marry

Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen, aus dem Jahre 1893 (Göttingen, 1893), pp. 436 *sq.*; Stanley A. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi* (London, 1903), p. 99. By "cousin on the father's side" Mr. Cook no doubt means "daughter of the father's brother"; but, as I have already pointed out, the ambiguous expression "cousin on the father's side" would include the cross-cousin, the daughter of the father's sister, as well as the ortho-cousin, the daughter of the father's brother.

[1] Edward William Lane, *The Arabian Nights Entertainment* (London, 1839), i. 62 note [11], compare *id.*, p. 320.

[2] E. W. Lane, *op. cit.* i. 65 note [14].

[3] G. A. Wilken, "Het matriarchaat bij de oude Arabieren," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), ii. 45. In Arabic the father's brother (*'amm*) is distinguished from the mother's brother (*châl*). See G. A. Wilken, *op. cit.* ii. 35.

[4] (Sir) Richard F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah* (London, 1855–1856), iii. 40 *sq.*

his relation, pays down the price of her as a deposit into the hands of some respectable member of the encampment, and places the girl under the protection of four men belonging to his own tribe. In this case she cannot marry another without his permission, whether he be absent or present; and he may then marry her at his leisure, whenever he pleases. If, however, he himself break off the match, the money that had been deposited is paid into the hands of the girl's master. This kind of betrothing takes place sometimes long before the girl has attained the age of puberty." [1]

Right to marry either the father's brother's daughter or the mother's brother's daughter among the Arabs of Moab.

It will be observed that in this passage Burckhardt indicates no preference for the father's brother's daughter as a bride over any other first cousin. In regard to the Arabs of Moab we are told that "every man can and ought to claim for himself the hand of his paternal or maternal uncle's daughter, to the exclusion of every other suitor. Seldom does he renounce the right voluntarily, and it is almost impossible to balk his hopes. Sometimes it happens that the father and daughter will not consent to this marriage, agreeable though it is to custom. But her cousin will not give up his right, and to enforce it he has recourse to the following stratagem. He takes five camels and brings them before the tent of the sheikh, who naturally has intervened in the discussions. Then, in presence of some witnesses, he says, 'Behold the camels for my cousin; I claim her.' The girl's father says to him, 'Take back your property. We do not want it.' The suitor goes home. Five days afterwards he returns, but with four camels only, and says, 'Behold my four camels for the girl; I want her.' 'Take back your camels,' says the father to him, 'we do not want them.' Five days afterwards, the suitor reappears before the sheikh's tent or before the tent of the girl's father, but with three camels only; he makes the same demand and receives the same answer. He makes two more attempts under similar conditions without obtaining the least success. Lastly, he presents himself either before the tent of the sheikh or before the tent of the girl's father, and sacrifices a sheep or a kid, saying, 'This is the sacrifice for (or of) the girl.'

[1] John Lewis Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábys* (London, 1830), i. 272 *sq.*

Henceforth he has a right to his cousin, and in fact carries her off to his home." This right to the hand of a cousin in marriage is recognized even among the Catholic Bedouins, and dispensations for such marriages are granted by the Church.[1]

Marriage with the father's brother's daughter or the mother's brother's daughter in Egypt.

Thus we learn that among the Arabs of Moab a man has the right to marry either his father's brother's daughter or his mother's brother's daughter. Similarly we read that "marriages with the daughter of a father's brother or of a mother's brother are especially orthodox and popular in Egypt."[2] "It is very common," says Lane, "among the Arabs of Egypt and of other countries, but less so in Cairo than in other parts of Egypt, for a man to marry his first cousin. In this case the husband and wife continue to call each other 'cousin,' because the tie of blood is indissoluble, but that of matrimony very precarious."[3] Though Lane does not here specify any particular kind of cousin, we may suppose that he had particularly in mind the marriage with a father's brother's daughter, since elsewhere, as we have seen,[4] he mentions the paternal uncle's daughter as the cousin who is often chosen as a wife. The supposition is confirmed by the usage of the Bisharin in the neighbourhood of Aswan, for among them "marriage with the daughter of the father's brother (*bint 'amm*) is the best, and a man would consider that he had prior right to the hand of his *bint 'amm*."[5] In Upper Egypt "the search for a bride is generally quite unnecessary, as in two-thirds of the cases it has been previously settled that the young fellow is to marry his female cousin, and if he has none, more distant relations are applied to, and lastly strangers. If these marriages of cousins had really such a prejudicial effect upon a race as they are usually represented to have, it must have been long ago noticed in Egypt; its inhabitants, however, show no inferiority either from a physical or an intellectual point of view."[6]

[1] Le P. Antonin Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab* (Paris, 1908), pp. 45–47.

[2] W. H. R. Rivers, *Kinship and Social Organization* (London, 1914), p. 79.

[3] Edward William Lane, *An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (Paisley and London, 1895), pp. 170 *sq.*

[4] Above, p. 256.

[5] C. G. Seligmann, "Note on Bisharin," *Man*, xv. (1915) p. 81.

[6] C. B. Klunzinger, M.D., *Upper Egypt* (London, 1878), p. 196.

Marriage with the father's brother's daughter in Morocco.

It seems that Arab influence is spreading this preference for marriage with a first cousin, especially with a daughter of the father's brother, throughout those African peoples who have been converted to Mohammedanism. "In Morocco marriages between cousins on the father's side are common both among Arabs and Berbers. A man is even held to have a certain right to his cousin's hand. In Andjra I was told that he ought to be asked if he wants to marry her, before she is given away to anybody else, and that, if this is not done, he is entitled to prevent her marriage even on the day of the wedding, by forcibly removing her from the bridal box; and among the Ulâd Bu ʿĂzîz a man who has contracted marriage with another man's paternal cousin can be compelled by the latter to give her up if he is compensated for his expenses, but only on condition that she has not yet settled down with him. In the Rîf instances are known in which an uncle who has married his daughter to another man has been killed by his nephew. The *ṣdaq* paid for a paternal cousin is often smaller than usual, although it also happens that a man tries to prevent his nephew from marrying his daughter by making his claims excessive. Marriages between paternal cousins are popular because they keep the property in the family, and, especially in shereefian families, because they preserve the blood pure. They are also said to be conducive to domestic happiness. *Li ḥāḍ bĕnt ʿámmu ʿăyyid mĕn ġélmu*, 'He who marries the daughter of his father's brother celebrates his feast with a sheep from his own flock'—he knows the sheep he slaughters. . . . It confers religious merit on a man to marry his cousin—by doing so he will not be punished on the day of the Resurrection; and at the same time it is a kind of duty."[1] The exact phrase here translated from the Arabic seems to show that throughout this passage the female cousin whom Dr. Westermarck has in mind is the daughter of the father's brother, though the ambiguous phrases which he uses ("cousins on the father's side," "paternal cousins") include the daughter of the father's sister as well as the daughter of the father's brother.

[1] Edward Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco* (London, 1914), pp. 53 *sq.*

Marriage with the father's brother's daughter among the Mohammedan Hausas.

Again, we are told that "a Mohammedan Hausa has the right to marry the daughter of his father's brother, and he will pay less for her, but not the daughter of his mother's brother, of his father's sister, nor of his mother's sister, though he may marry even the last of these if both parties agree, at any rate in North Africa."[1] The statement is not perfectly clear, but the writer seems to mean, that, while a Mohammedan Hausa is free to marry any of his first cousins, even the daughter of his mother's sister, the only one of them whom he has the right to marry, and whom he can buy cheaper than any other woman, is the daughter of his father's brother.

Preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter among the Arabs and among the people who have derived their law from them.

Taken together, the foregoing testimonies appear to evince among the Arabs and peoples who have derived their law from them a decided preference for the marriage of a man with his ortho-cousin, the daughter of his father's brother; the general rule seems to be that a man has a prior right to the hand of his father's brother's daughter and can obtain her in marriage for a smaller sum than he would pay for any other wife. The question arises, what is the origin of this preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter? Why can she be had cheaper than any other wife?

The preference cannot be derived from the dual organization, which bars such marriages.

One thing at least is plain: the preference cannot, like the preference for marriage with a cross-cousin, be traced directly to the dual organization of society, that is, to the division of a community into two exogamous and intermarrying classes, since under such a system the children of two brothers would always belong to the same exogamous class, whether descent were traced in the paternal or in the maternal line, and therefore they would not be marriageable with each other. Hence if, as I have endeavoured to show, the whole custom of exogamy sprang from the dual organization, it seems to follow that the preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter, which was barred by that primitive system, must have originated later than the marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister,

[1] Major A. J. N. Tremearne, *The Ban of the Bori* (London, N.D., preface dated 1914), p. 121.

since marriage with a cross-cousin, far from being barred, was directly favoured by the dual organization. With this inference it tallies that while the preference for marriage with a cross-cousin is very general, the preference for marriage with an ortho-cousin, the daughter of a father's brother, is comparatively rare and exceptional.

Wilken's theory that the preference for such marriages originated in ignorance of paternity.

What, then, is the ground of the preference for marriage with the daughter of a father's brother? How did it come about that some people should prefer a marriage which flatly contradicted the fundamental principle of exogamy? It is not enough to say that the motive was an economic one, the daughter of the father's brother costing less than any other wife; for we have still to ask, why should she cost less than any other wife? and in particular why should she cost less than a cross-cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother or of a father's sister, marriage with whom, instead of being forbidden, was directly encouraged by the fundamental principle of exogamy as embodied in the dual organization? I cannot see that any clear and satisfactory answer to these questions has been given. The Dutch ethnologist, G. A. Wilken, thought that the preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter dates from a time when paternity, as a physical relation, was as yet unknown, and when consequently the children of two brothers were not recognized as blood relations to each other.[1] The explanation seems inadequate. It would explain why such marriages were allowed, it does not explain why they were preferred to any other. Indeed, closely regarded, the theory is self-contradictory; for if no relationship were recognized between the children of two brothers, how could a preference for the union of these children possibly have occurred to anybody? Surely, the mere fact of the preference is a proof that a relation of some sort was known or believed to exist between the persons whose marriage was deemed desirable.

Robertson Smith's theory that such marriages originated in fraternal polyandry.

A different explanation of the preference for marriage with the daughter of a father's brother was put forward by W. Robertson Smith. He supposed that the preference

[1] G. A. Wilken, "Het Matriarchaat bij de oude Arabieren," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), ii. 45 *sq.*

originated in a system of fraternal polyandry, under which several brothers are married to one wife, and the children accordingly, unable to distinguish their individual fathers, regard all the brothers indifferently as their common fathers.[1] But this answer also fails to meet the difficulty; for under such a system the children of the various brothers naturally regard each other as brothers and sisters, as indeed they all are on the mother's side and as some of them may be on the father's side also; hence, as brothers and sisters, they would not be marriageable with each other. And even when the polyandrous family split up into several families, each brother with a wife and children of his own, the old view of the relation between the children of the several brothers as themselves brothers and sisters would be likely to persist and to form a bar to marriage between them. It seems, therefore, difficult to understand how a preference for marriage with the daughter of a father's brother could originate in a system of fraternal polyandry.

Marriage with the father's brother's daughter is apparently much later in origin than marriage with a cross-cousin: it probably implies a system of father-kin, and is based on a wish to allow daughters to share the family inheritance.

On the whole it appears to be probable that, contrary to the opinion both of Wilken and of Robertson Smith, the preference for marriage with a father's brother's daughter originated, not in the uncertainty, but in the certainty of fatherhood, and therefore that, as I have already argued on other grounds, it is of much later origin than the preference for marriage with a cross-cousin, which, if I am right, probably dates from a time when physical paternity was as yet unknown. Further, the preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter probably everywhere, as with the Arabs, coexists with and implies a system of father-kin, that is, a system of relationship which traces descent from the father instead of from the mother; and that co-existence and implication in turn furnish a fresh reason for regarding the preference in question as a comparatively late development, since as a general rule the system of father-kin is later than the system of mother-kin, which it everywhere tends to replace.[2] On the whole, these considerations

[1] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, New Edition (London, 1903), pp. 163 *sq.*

[2] On this subject see E. Sidney Hartland, "Matrilineal Kinship, and the Question of its Priority," *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, vol. iv. No. 1 (Jan.–March, 1917).

point to the conclusion that the preference for marriage with the father's brother's daughter arose at a time when the relation of children to their father was not only recognized but regarded as more important than the relation to their mother, and when consequently, property descending in the male line, men had an economic motive for marrying their daughters to their brothers' sons in order to allow them to share the family inheritance. Under such circumstances it would be natural that a father should ask less for the hand of his daughter from his brother's son than from a stranger or even from his sister's son, who, under the system of father-kin, would inherit none of his mother's brother's property and would not therefore have any advantage to offer as a match to his mother's brother's daughter. Thus we can perhaps understand how the substitution of father-kin for mother-kin should lead in time to a corresponding substitution of marriage with an ortho-cousin, the father's brother's daughter, for the old marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister. Among the Arabs, with whom the system of father-kin has long been established, the preference for marriage with the ortho-cousin, the father's brother's daughter, is decided and is perhaps gaining ground; but the evidence I have adduced suffices to prove that even among them this comparatively new form of marriage has not yet entirely ousted that old marriage with a cross-cousin, the daughter of a mother's brother, of which the classical instance is Jacob's marriage with Leah and Rachel.

§ 16. *The Sororate and Levirate*

Jacob's marriage with his cousins.

We set out to explain why Jacob married his cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, and we have found an explanation which fits very well with his thrifty and frugal, not to say grasping and avaricious, nature; for it appears that similar marriages with the daughter either of a mother's brother or of a father's sister have been widely popular throughout the world, and that they owe their popularity in large measure to their cheapness, a man having a claim on the hands of such cousins and getting them to wife, either

for nothing, or at a lower rate than he would have had to pay for wives who were not so related to him.

Jacob's marriage with two sisters in their lifetime.

But we have still to consider a remarkable feature in Jacob's marriage. He married two sisters in their lifetime, one after the other; for having fallen in love with the younger sister, he was told that he might not wed her unless he first wedded her elder sister, since it was contrary to the custom of the country for a younger sister to marry before an elder. Accordingly, Jacob complied with the custom; he married the elder sister Leah first, and a week later he married her younger sister Rachel also.[1]

Wide-spread custom of marrying several sisters, one after the other, in order of seniority.

In these respects the marriage of Jacob corresponded with customs which have been observed in many parts of the world; for many races have allowed a man to marry all his wife's sisters and have even given him a prior claim to their hands, provided that he marries them one after the other in order of seniority, beginning with the eldest and working his way down to the youngest. Accordingly we may surmise that, in acting as he did, Jacob merely followed an old well-established usage of his people, though in later time Jewish law forbade a man to marry two sisters in their lifetime.[2] The prohibition implies that it was still lawful to marry a deceased wife's sister, and it points to an earlier practice of marrying two or more sisters in their lifetime after the example of Jacob, whose conduct in this respect was apparently deemed blameless by the sacred historian. The surmise that marriage with two sisters in their lifetime was an ancient Semitic custom is confirmed by Babylonian practice, which is known to have sanctioned such unions.[3]

The sororate and the levirate.

While many peoples allow or even encourage a man to marry several sisters in their lifetime, others only permit him to marry them successively, each after the death of her predecessor; but we may assume that this restriction is a later modification of the older rule which sanctioned marriage with several sisters simultaneously. In this later form the custom is parallel to the common usage which allows or enjoins a man to marry the widow of his deceased brother. The

[1] Genesis xxix. 15-30.

[2] Leviticus xviii. 18.

[3] C. H. W. Johns, *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters* (Edinburgh, 1904), pp. 138 *sqq.*; A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*[2] (Leipsic, 1906), p. 358.

practice of marriage with a deceased wife's sister is in a sense the counterpart of the practice of marriage with a deceased brother's wife; the two are often observed by the same people, and it is reasonable to suppose that they are vitally connected and admit of a similar explanation. The custom of marriage with a deceased brother's wife is commonly called the levirate; it is best known from the Hebrew usage, which required that when a man died without sons, his brother should marry the widow and beget a son, who was to be counted the son of the dead man and not of his real father.[1] The corresponding custom of marriage with a deceased wife's sister has no generally recognized name; hence for the sake of convenience I have adopted the term *sororate*, from the Latin *soror*, to designate all marriages with a wife's sister, whether in the lifetime of the first wife or after her death.[2] Thus the term *sororate* answers to the term *levirate* from the Latin *levir*, "a husband's brother."

Distinction between the sororate and the levirate in regard to seniority.

While the custom of marrying a deceased wife's sister answers on the whole to the custom of marrying a deceased brother's wife, a remarkable distinction is nevertheless commonly made between them. For whereas a man is usually allowed to marry only his deceased wife's *younger* sister, he is generally permitted to marry only the widow of his deceased *elder* brother. The reason for this distinction does not lie on the surface; perhaps it may emerge in the course of our inquiry.

The sororate and the levirate are complementary customs.

Of the two customs, the levirate has attracted much attention and been discussed at length by eminent writers,[3] but the corresponding custom of the sororate has been almost wholly overlooked and consequently has remained nameless. Yet if the two customs are really complementary, it must obviously be futile to seek an explanation of the one without taking account of the other. Accordingly, in what follows I shall treat of the two together, dwelling, however, more especially on the sororate, because it is less familiar and has

[1] Genesis xxxviii. 8 *sq.*; Deuteronomy xxv. 5-10.

[2] *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 139 *sqq.*

[3] See, for example, J. F. McLennan, *Studies in Ancient History*, New Edition (London, 1886), pp. 108 *sqq.*; *id.*, *The Patriarchal Theory* (London, 1885), pp. 156 *sqq.*; A. H. Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz* (Oldenburg and Leipsic, 1887), i. 419 *sqq.*; E. Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (London, 1891), pp. 510 *sqq.*

been far less copiously illustrated than the twin custom of the levirate.[1]

The sororate and the levirate common among the Indian tribes of North America.

The custom of the sororate was widely prevalent among the Indian tribes of North America, both in its original form of marriage with several sisters in their lifetime and in its later form of marriage with a deceased wife's sister; and the custom of the levirate was also common among the Redskins. The great American ethnologist, Lewis H. Morgan, who spent years of research among the Indians of North America, informs us that the sororate in its full original form was recognized in at least forty of their tribes. "Where a man married the eldest daughter of a family he became entitled by custom to all her sisters as wives when they attained the marriageable age. It was a right seldom enforced, from the difficulty on the part of the individual of maintaining several families, although polygamy was recognized universally as a privilege of the males."[2] Similarly, another good authority writes that "with the plains tribes, and perhaps with others, the man who marries the eldest of several daughters has prior claim upon her unmarried sisters."[3] For example, among the Osages "polygamy is usual; for it is a custom that, when a savage asks a girl in marriage and gets her to wife, not only she but all her sisters belong to him and are regarded as his wives. It is a great glory among them to have several."[4] Among the Kansas, a tribe closely allied to the Osages in blood and language, "when the eldest daughter marries, she commands the lodge, the mother, and all the sisters; the latter are to be also the wives of the same individual. . . . They have, in some instances, four or five wives; but these are

The sororate among the Osages.

The sororate and levirate among the Kansas.

[1] The two customs have already been discussed and explained by me in *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 139 *sqq*. As that work is probably in the hands of few of my readers, I here reproduce much of the evidence, adding some fresh examples.

[2] Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (London, 1877), p. 432. Compare *id.*, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City, 1871), pp. 477 *sq*., "When a man marries the eldest daughter he becomes by that act entitled to each and all of her sisters as wives when they severally attain the marriageable age. The option rests with him, and he may enforce the claim, or yield it to another."

[3] J. Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee," *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, Part i. (Washington, 1900) p. 491.

[4] *Annales de l'Association de la Propagation de la Foi*, No. v. (Mars, 1825) (Second Edition, Lyons and Paris, 1829) p. 56.

mostly sisters; if they marry into two families the wives do not harmonize well together, and give the husband much inquietude." Further, among the Kansas, "after the death of the husband the widow scarifies herself, rubs her person with clay, and becomes negligent of her dress, until the expiration of a year, when the eldest brother of the deceased takes her to wife without any ceremony, considers her children as his own, and takes her and them to his house; if the deceased left no brother, she marries whom she pleases."[1] Thus the Kansas observe the customs both of the sororate and of the levirate. So, too, among the Omahas, a kindred tribe of the Missouri valley, "polygamy is extremely common, the individual who weds the eldest daughter, espouses all the sisters successively, and receives them into his house when they arrive at a proper age."[2] And in this tribe, upon the death of the husband, "if the deceased has left a brother, he takes the widow to his lodge after a proper interval, and considers her as his wife, without any preparatory formality."[3] Thus the Omahas practise, or rather used to practise, both the sororate and the levirate. Similarly among the Hidatsas or Minnetarees, a tribe of the Upper Missouri valley, "polygamy is practised, but usually with certain restrictions. A man who marries the eldest of several sisters has a claim to the others as they grow up; and in most cases marries them, unless they, in the mean-

The sororate and levirate among the Omahas.

The sororate and levirate among the Hidatsas or Minnetarees.

[1] Edwin James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains under the Command of Major S. H. Long* (London, 1823), i. 115, 116. By "the eldest brother of the deceased" is probably meant "the eldest surviving brother," who may be younger than the deceased. For the usual rule is, as I have said, that only a younger brother may marry his deceased brother's widow.

[2] Edwin James, *op. cit.* i. 209. Later observers, writing at a time when the old tribal customs had been modified or abolished, report that among the Omahas "polygamy existed, although it was not the rule; in the majority of families there was but one wife. A man rarely had more than two wives, and these were generally sisters or aunt and niece." See Alice C. Fletcher and Francis La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe," *Twenty-Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1905–1906* (Washington, 1911), p. 326. Both the sororate and the levirate seem to have fallen into decay when the Rev. J. Owen Dorsey investigated the tribe in the second half of the nineteenth century. He tells us that a man sometimes married his deceased wife's sister at the express wish of the dying woman, and that a man married his deceased brother's widow in order to become the "little father" of his brother's children. See J. Owen Dorsey, "Omaha Sociology," *Third Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, 1884), p. 258.

[3] Edwin James, *op. cit.* i. 222 *sq.*

time, form other attachments and refuse to live with him. As certain female cousins are regarded as younger sisters, a man has often much latitude in selecting wives under this law. A man usually takes to wife the widow of a brother, unless she expresses an unwillingness to the arrangement, and he may adopt the orphans as his own children."[1] The extension of the term "sister" to certain cousins is an effect of the classificatory or group system of relationship which the Hidatsas or Minnetarees possess in common with most, if not all, Indian tribes of North America. Under the Minnetaree form of that system a woman calls her female ortho-cousins (the daughters of her father's brother and of her mother's sister) her "sisters";[2] and when we speak of marriage with several sisters among peoples who observe the classificatory or group system of relationship, we must always allow for a similar latitude in the use of the term "sisters."

The sororate and levirate among the Apaches.

Again, among the Apaches of Arizona polygamy is customary, but it is subject to certain restrictions. A man will marry his wife's younger sisters as fast as they grow to maturity, or, if his first wife has no sisters, he will try to marry a woman of the same clan, because "there will be less danger of the women fighting." Further, an Apache marries his deceased brother's widow; but he must exercise his right within a year of his brother's death, otherwise the widow is free to marry whom she pleases.[3] Thus the Apaches observe the customs both of the sororate and of the levirate. As to the Indians of these south-western deserts, among whom the Apaches are included, we are told that "in general, when an Indian wishes to have many wives he chooses above all others, if he can, sisters, because he thinks he can thus secure more domestic peace."[4]

The sororate and levirate among the Blackfoot Indians.

Again, among the Blackfoot Indians of the northern plains all the younger sisters of a man's wife were re-

[1] Washington Matthews, *Ethnography and Philology of the Hidatsa Indians* (Washington, 1877), p. 53.

[2] Lewis H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City, 1871), pp. 188 *sq.*, 316 *sq.*

[3] John G. Bourke, "Notes upon the Gentile Organization of the Apaches of Arizona," *Journal of American Folk-lore*, iii. (1890) p. 118.

[4] E. Domenech, *Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America* (London, 1860), ii. 306.

garded as his wives if he chose to take them, and they could not be disposed of to any other man without his consent. And when a man died, his widows became the wives of his oldest brother, if he wished to marry them.[1] Here, again, therefore, we find the sororate and the levirate practised by the same tribe. The same combination meets us also in the large northern tribe of the Ojibways or Chippewas. Among them a man might marry as many wives as he could support, but they generally chose sisters, "from an idea that they will be more likely to live together in peace, and that the children of the one would be loved and cared for by the other more than if the wives were not related."[2] In this tribe "the relation of fraternity is strongly marked; a man is held to be bound to marry the widow of his deceased brother, yet he ought not to do it until after a year of widowhood. He is likewise considered as obliged to provide for his brother's offspring, but this care not unfrequently devolves upon the grandfather."[3] As to the Pottawatamies, an Indian tribe in the region of the Great Lakes, we are told that "it was usual for them, when an Indian married one of several sisters, to consider him as wedded to all; and it became incumbent upon him to take them all as wives. The marrying of a brother's widow was not interdicted, but was always looked upon as a very improper connexion."[4] Thus the Pottawatamies practised the sororate and discouraged, though they did not forbid, the levirate. This divergence in regard to the two forms of marriage appears to be rare and exceptional. Speaking of the Indian tribes near the Great Lakes, a writer of the eighteenth century observes that "it is not uncommon for an Indian to marry two sisters; sometimes, if there happen to be more, the whole number; and notwithstanding this (as it appears to civilized nations) unnatural union, they all live in the greatest harmony."[5] Amongst the Mandans, when a man married an eldest

The sororate and levirate among the Ojibways.

The sororate and levirate among the Pottawatamies.

The sororate among the Mandans and Crows.

[1] G. B. Grinnell, *Blackfoot Lodge Tales* (London, 1893), pp. 217, 218.

[2] Rev. Peter Jones, *History of the Ojebway Indians* (London, N.D.), p. 81.

[3] W. H. Keating, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River* (London, 1825), ii. 166 *sq.*

[4] W. H. Keating, *op. cit.* i. 111.

[5] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, Third Edition (London, 1781), p. 367.

daughter he had a right to all her sisters.[1] Similarly among the Crows, if a man married the eldest daughter of a family he had a right to marry all her younger sisters when they grew up, even in the lifetime of his first wife, their eldest sister. He might waive his right, but if he stood upon it, his superior claim would be acknowledged by the woman's kinsfolk.[2] Among the Arapahoes, an Algonquin tribe inhabiting the country about the head waters of the Arkansas and Platte rivers, "a wife's next younger sister, if of marriageable age, is sometimes given to her husband if his brother-in-law likes him. Sometimes the husband asks and pays for his wife's younger sister. This may be done several times if she has several sisters. If his wife has no sister, a cousin (also called 'sister') is sometimes given to him. When a woman dies, her husband marries her sister. When a man dies, his brother sometimes marries his wife. He is expected to do so. Sometimes she marries another man."[3] From this account it seems that among the Arapahoes both the sororate and the levirate are falling into decay. A man can no longer claim the hands of his wife's younger sisters as a right in her lifetime, though apparently after her death he marries one or more of them as a matter of course. Again, he is expected to marry his deceased brother's widow, though he has not an absolute right to do so.

The sororate and levirate among the Arapahoes.

In some tribes of American Indians the sororate appears to survive only in its later form as a right or an obligation to marry a deceased wife's sister. For example, among the Assiniboins, a northern tribe, "polygamy was frequent. The levirate was also commonly practised. A married woman will still wait on her brothers-in-law as if they were her husbands, though there is no sexual intercourse between them. If a man's wife dies, he has a pre-emptive right to her younger sister, and if the girl is still immature she is kept for him until puberty."[4] Among the Iroquois

The levirate and the sororate, in the form of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, among the Indians of North America.

[1] Maximilian Prinz zu Wied, *Reise in das Innere Nord-America* (Coblenz, 1839–1841), ii. 130.

[2] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, p. 160.

[3] Alfred L. Kroeber, *The Arapaho* (New York, 1902), p. 14 (*Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. xviii. Part i.).

[4] Robert H. Lowie, *The Assiniboine* (New York, 1909), p. 41 (*Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. iv. Part i.).

polygamy was forbidden and never became a practice;[1] hence with them there was no question of a man marrying several sisters in their lifetime. Nevertheless, when his wife died, an Iroquois was regularly obliged to marry her sister, or, in default of a sister, such other woman as the family of his deceased wife might provide for him. A man who should refuse to wed his deceased wife's sister would, we are told, expose himself to all the abuse and vituperation which the injured woman chose to heap on his devoted head, and a sense of his moral delinquency compelled him to submit to the torrent of invective in silence. Similarly, a childless widow was compelled to marry one of her deceased husband's brothers or other of his relations, in order to bear a child to the dead man.[2] Among the Biloxi, a small tribe of the Siouan or Dacotan stock in what is now the State of Mississippi, a man might marry his deceased wife's sister, and a woman might marry her deceased husband's brother;[3] but it does not appear that there was any obligation to contract either of these unions. Among the Pima Indians of Arizona it was customary for a widower to marry his deceased wife's sister.[4] However, it seems probable that among these southern Indians the sororate was once practised in its full form. An anonymous French writer, who appears to have lived and written not later than the early years of the eighteenth century, tells us that among the tribes of the lower Mississippi valley "a savage marries as many women as he wishes; he is even in some manner obliged to in certain cases. If the father and mother of his wife die and if she has many sisters, he marries them all, so that nothing is more common than to see four or five sisters the wives of a single husband."[5]

[1] Lewis H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois* (Rochester, 1851), p. 324.

[2] Charlevoix, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France* (Paris, 1744), v. 419; compare J. F. Lafitau, *Mœurs des sauvages Ameriquains* (Paris, 1724), i. 560.

[3] J. Owen Dorsey, "Siouan Sociology," *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, 1897), p. 244.

[4] Frank Russell, "The Pima Indians," *Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (Washington, 1908), p. 184.

[5] Quoted by John R. Swanton, *Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley and adjacent coast of the Gulf of Mexico* (Washington, 1911), p. 95 (*Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 43*).

The sororate and levirate among the Indian tribes of California and Oregon.

Thus far we have been dealing with the Indian tribes to the east of the Rocky Mountains. But both the sororate and the levirate are, or were, observed by many tribes on the Pacific slopes of that great range. Perhaps the rudest of all the Indian tribes of North America were the aborigines of the Californian Peninsula, and among them, "before they were baptized, each man took as many wives as he liked, and if there were several sisters in a family he married them all together."[1] Farther to the north, at Monterey in California, it was likewise customary for a man to marry all the sisters of one family.[2] Still farther to the north, among the Northern Maidus, another Californian tribe, a man had a right to marry his wife's sisters, and if he did not choose to exercise his right, it passed, very significantly, to his brother. The full meaning of this transference of marital rights from one brother to another will appear in the sequel. In this tribe, also, a man usually married his deceased brother's widow; in other words, the levirate was customary but not obligatory.[3] Passing still farther northward, we come to the tribes of Oregon, the Flatheads, Nez Percés, Spokans, Walla-wallas, Cayuse, and Waskows, and "with all of them, marrying the eldest daughter entitles a man to the rest of the family, as they grow up. If a wife dies, her sister or some of the connexion, if younger than the deceased, is regarded as destined to marry him. Cases occur in which, upon the death of a wife (after the period of mourning referred to below expires), her younger sister, though the wife of another man, is claimed, and she deserts her husband and goes to the disconsolate widower. The right of a man is recognised to put away his wife, and take a new one, even the sister of the discarded one, if he thinks proper. The parents do not seem to object to a man's turning off one sister, and taking a younger one—the lordly prerogative, as imperious as that of a sultan, being a custom

[1] J. Baegert, "An Account of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Californian Peninsula," *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for the year 1863*, p. 368.

[2] La Pérouse, *Voyage*, ii. 303, quoted by H. H. Bancroft, *Native Races of the Pacific States of North America* (London, 1875–1876), i. 388, note [121].

[3] Roland E. Dixon, *The Northern Maidu* (New York, 1905), pp. 239, 241 (*Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. xvii. Part iii.).

handed down from time immemorial."[1] The right to marry a wife's sister must indeed be a strong one when it can thus supersede the existing right of the husband in possession. Further, we see that among these Indians of Oregon the right to marry a deceased wife's sister is merely a consequence of the right to marry them in the wife's lifetime.

The sororate and levirate among the Indian tribes of North-Western America.

Still farther to the north the sororate occurs, in conjunction with the levirate, in several tribes of British Columbia. Thus among the Lkuñgen, when a man's wife died, he married her sister or cousin; and when a woman's husband died, she married his brother or cousin.[2] Again, among the Thompson Indians polygamy flourished, very many men having from two to four wives, all of whom were sometimes sisters. When a man's wife died, he was expected to seek another wife among the sisters or relatives of the dead woman. And correspondingly, when a husband died, the widow became the property of the dead man's nearest male kin, generally of the brother next in seniority. The right of a man to the widow of his deceased brother was incontestable, and the widow had an equal right to demand from him the privileges of a husband; moreover, he was bound to support her children.[3] The marriage customs of the neighbouring Shuswap were similar. When a man's wife died, the period of mourning was no sooner over than he was obliged to marry the sister or other nearest relative of his departed spouse; indeed, during the days of mourning he was kept a prisoner in the house of his brother-in-law, so that even if he wished to shirk the obligation of marrying his deceased wife's sister, his chances of succeeding in the unmanly attempt were hardly worth considering. He was only let out of the house of mourning to enter the house of marriage. Similarly, when a man died, his widow married

[1] Major B. Alvord, "Concerning the manners and customs, the superstitions, etc., of the Indians in Oregon," in H. R. Schoolcraft's *Indian Tribes of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1853–1856), v. 654 *sq.*

[2] Franz Boas, in "Sixth Report on the North-Western Tribes of Canada," in *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Leeds Meeting, 1890*, p. 24 (of the separate reprint).

[3] James Teit, *The Thompson Indians of British Columbia*, pp. 325, 326 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History*, April, 1900).

her deceased husband's brother or other nearest relative; and she, too, had to remain in the house of bondage as well as of mourning with her brother-in-law till the time came for her to doff her widow's weeds and don her bridal attire.[1] However, it seems that her brother-in-law was not under the same rigorous obligation to marry her; for if he did not care to take her to wife, he might call all the people together and say, "I wish you all to know that I do not take my brother's widow to wife, and I herewith give her to my friend" (mentioning his name), "who will henceforth be the same to me as my deceased brother was. Now it will be the same as if my brother were alive. My friend" (mentioning his name) "and I will henceforth be the same as brothers until one of us dies." The man then gave a feast to the people, and the widow took her place with the husband chosen for her. As a rule, the woman's consent to the arrangement was asked beforehand.[2] Among the Crees or Knisteneaux, "when a man loses his wife, it is considered as a duty to marry her sister, if she has one; or he may, if he pleases, have them both at the same time."[3] Again, among the Northern Tinnehs, who border on the Eskimo in the far North, men made no scruple of having two or three sisters as wives at one time;[4] and similarly among the Kaviaks of Alaska "two or three wives, often sisters, are taken by those who can afford to support them."[5]

The sororate and levirate among the Indian tribes of South America.

The marriage customs of the Indians of South America have never been accurately studied, but they appear to include both the sororate and the levirate. Thus among the Roucouyen Indians of French Guiana, when a man's wife dies, he marries her sister or sisters; and when a woman's husband dies, she marries his eldest brother or, in default of brothers, his father. The right of marriage in both cases is

[1] Franz Boas, in "Sixth Report on the North-Western Tribes of Canada," in *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Leeds Meeting, 1890*, p. 91 (of the separate reprint).

[2] James Teit, *The Shuswap* (Leyden and New York, 1909), pp. 591 *sq.* (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History, New York*).

[3] A. Mackenzie, *Voyages from Montreal through the Continent of North America* (London, 1801), pp. xcvi *sq.*

[4] S. Hearne, *Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean* (London, 1795), p. 130.

[5] W. H. Dall, *Alaska and its Resources* (London, 1870), p. 138.

undisputed, but it is sometimes renounced by the claimant.[1] Among the Caribs "very often the same man will take to wife three or four sisters, who will be his cousins-german or his nieces. They maintain that, having been brought up together, the women will love each other the more, will live in a better understanding, will help each other more readily, and, what is most advantageous for him, will serve him better."[2] Among the Macusis of British Guiana polygamy seems to be rare, but Sir Richard Schomburgk met with one man who had three sisters to wife.[3] Among the Onas and Yahgans, two tribes of Tierra del Fuego, both the sororate and the levirate seem to be in vogue. In both tribes it is said to be a common practice for a man to marry two sisters, and in both tribes a man often marries his brother's widow.[4] The custom of the levirate appears to be more frequently reported than the custom of the sororate among the Indian tribes of South America,[5] and it is possible that it may really be more commonly observed by them; but our knowledge of these aborigines is too meagre to warrant us in laying down any general propositions on the subject.

The sororate and levirate in Africa.

In Africa the customs both of the sororate and of the levirate seem to be widely spread, especially among tribes of the Bantu stock. Thus Kafir law permits a man to marry two sisters in their lifetime,[6] and it is the ordinary custom for a man to marry his deceased brother's wife.[7] Among the Zulus, for example, marriages with two sisters in their lifetime are common;[8] and the brother or next of

The sororate and levirate among the Zulus and other Kafir tribes of South-East Africa.

[1] Henri Coudreau, *Chez nos Indiens, Quatre Années dans la Guyane Française* (Paris, 1895), p. 128.

[2] Labat, *Nouveau Voyage aux Isles de l'Amerique*, Nouvelle Édition (Paris, 1742), ii. 77 *sq.*

[3] R. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana* (Leipsic, 1847–1848), ii. 318.

[4] John M. Cooper, *Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and adjacent territory* (Washington, 1917), p. 165 (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 63*).

[5] It is practised by the Warraus of British Guiana (R. Schomburgk, *op. cit.* ii. 447), by the Goajiros (F. A. A. Simons, "An Exploration of the Goajira Peninsula," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, New Series, vii. (1885) p. 792), and by many tribes of Brazil (C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Zur Ethnographie Amerika's zumal Brasiliens*, Leipsic, 1867, p. 117).

[6] Col. Maclean, *Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (Cape Town, 1866), pp. 61, 112, 159.

[7] J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country* (London, 1857), pp. 46, 86.

[8] F. Speckmann, *Die Hermannsburger Mission in Afrika* (Hermannsburg, 1876), p. 135. Compare J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, p. 46, "A man, for example, may marry two sisters."

kin cohabits with the widow in order to raise up seed to the dead. The same custom of the levirate is observed also by the Swazies and Pondos, two other Kafir tribes of South-East Africa, but curiously enough it is utterly at variance with the usages of the Tembus and Gaikas, two other Kafir tribes of the same region.[1] In regard to the levirate as practised by the Zulus, we read that "when a man dies and leaves wives, it is the custom that his younger brother goes to the dead man's wives and begets children for him; for the children whom the wives get by the brother of the deceased belong to the latter and not to the former. However, the custom seems not to be obligatory but simply voluntary. If the younger brother dies, it is not at all customary for the elder brother to go to the wives of the deceased; it is only the younger who begets children for the elder."[2] So, too, among the Fingoes it is a younger brother who marries his deceased elder brother's wife.[3] The levirate is observed with the same limitation by the Thonga, a Bantu tribe of Mozambique. Among them a man has a prior right to inherit his deceased elder brother's wife; even during her husband's life a woman is very free in her manners with her husband's younger brothers, and they will play with her because they have the right of inheriting her, one after the other, when her first husband is dead. On the other hand, a man may only inherit the wife of his deceased younger brother if she is old and past the age of child-bearing. To marry a younger brother's widow, who might still give birth to a child, would be strongly opposed to the feelings of the tribe, though in exceptional cases it may be done, if no one else has a claim to her. Hence a man carefully avoids the wives of his younger brother, while his younger brother is still alive, which is quite contrary to the freedom he uses with his elder brother's wives in the lifetime of his elder brother.[4] A similar sharp

The levirate and sororate among the Thonga of Mozambique.

[1] Rev. J. Macdonald, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xix. (1890) p. 272; Dudley Kidd, *The Essential Kafir* (London, 1904), p. 226.

[2] F. Speckmann, *Die Hermannsburger Mission in Afrika* (Hermannsburg, 1876), pp. 135 *sq.*

[3] Col. Maclean, *Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs*, p. 159.

[4] Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe* (Neuchâtel, 1912–1913), i. 236, 248.

distinction is drawn for a similar reason by the Thonga between a wife's elder and younger sisters. A man may play and romp with his wife's younger sisters, because they are his presumptive wives; he has a preferential right to marry them either in his first wife's life or after her death. But he may not play with his wife's elder sisters, because he cannot marry them. With the Thonga, as with Laban's kinsfolk, it is the law that an elder sister must always marry before her younger sisters. A father would not consent to give away the younger before the elder. There is a special term (*nhlantsa*) applied to a younger sister married to the same husband as her elder sister, while the elder sister is still alive. The term is thought to come from a verb "to wash" (*hlantsa*), because the younger sister in such a household washes the dishes for her elder sister and works more or less as her servant.[1]

The sororate and levirate among the Bechuanas.

"Among the Bechuanas the daughter is considered to be the property of her father, and if he sells her, it is in order to procure an establishment for his male children, or to provide for his future needs in old age, should he be abandoned by his family. Like Laban and like the Hindoos, a father does not give the second daughter in marriage before the elder. If the elder dies without leaving children, the husband has the right to demand her sister or to get back the bride-price. If he dies before her, his brother succeeds him. He makes his father-in-law a small present and kills an ox, with the gall of which he and his bride besprinkle themselves in token of purification; but there is not, properly speaking, any marriage ceremony. A man is not compelled to marry his brother's widow; in that case she is quite free to return to her father or to take another husband."[2] Thus we see that the Bechuanas observe both the levirate and the sororate, and that among them, as among the Thonga, a younger sister may not marry before an elder. Among the Basutos "the death of the husband

[1] Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, i. 234 *sq.*, 252.

[2] T. Arbousset et F. Daumas, *Relation d'un Voyage d'Exploration au Nord-Est de la Colonie du Cap de Bonne-Espérance* (Paris, 1842), p. 76. Compare E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (London, 1861), p. 184, "The custom which forbade the marriage of Rachel before Leah still exists in full force among the Bechuanas."

The levirate among the Basutos.

does not liberate the wife. She falls by law to one of the brothers or to the nearest relation of the deceased. There, the institution of the levirate is not subject to the wise restrictions made by Moses for the people of Israel. Although the children of this second union bear the name of the first husband, and are understood to belong to him and to inherit his possessions, while they have very small claim to the succession of their real father, the fact that the widow is compelled to remain in the family, although she has already borne children to the deceased, proves that the purchase of which she was the object is the chief obstacle to her liberation."[1]

The sororate and levirate among the Herero.

Among the Herero, a Bantu tribe of South-West Africa, both the sororate and the levirate are in vogue. In order to marry a certain woman, a Herero man is often obliged, like Jacob, to begin by marrying her sister, and when his wife dies he marries her sister instead.[2] It is a rule of Herero law that the principal heir inherits the widow of the deceased; and as the heir is usually a younger brother, it follows that such marriages conform to the levirate custom.[3]

The sororate among the Matabele, and the Bantu and Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo.

In the powerful Bantu tribe of the Matabele, when a wife dies soon after marriage or remains barren, her husband has a right to claim her sister or nearest relation in place of her.[4] Among the Bantu tribes of Kavirondo a man has the right to marry all his wife's younger sisters as they come of age; they may not be given in marriage to any one until he has declined their hands. When a wife dies childless, her husband can reclaim the amount he paid for her to her father; but if the father happens to have another daughter the widower, instead of exacting repayment, generally consoles himself by marrying his deceased wife's sister, who costs him nothing beyond a few goats slaughtered for

[1] Rev. E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (London, 1861), p. 190.

[2] J. Irle, *Die Herero* (Gütersloh, 1906), p. 109. The reason why, in order to marry a certain woman, a man must often first marry her sister, is not mentioned by the writer. We may conjecture that among the Herero, as among the Thonga and the Bechuanas, a younger sister may not marry before her elder sister; hence a man who loves the younger sister will, like Jacob, marry the elder in order to obtain the right of marrying the younger.

[3] E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero* (Berlin, 1906), p. 38.

[4] Lionel Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa* (London, 1898), p. 158.

the marriage feast.[1] Among the Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo, when a wife is proved to be barren, her parents send her sister to be the man's wife; but he does not divorce his first spouse, both sisters live together with him as his wives.[2]

The sororate and levirate among the Basoga.

Among the Basoga, a Bantu tribe of the Uganda Protectorate, a bride is attended to her new home by a sister, who remains with her and attends to her wants during the period of seclusion which is incumbent on Basoga women after marriage. Often the sister does not return home, but remains with the bride and becomes a second wife to the bridegroom. He must pay a marriage-fee for her, but in the case of such a second wife the preparatory ceremonies are dispensed with, and she falls into her place in the household at once.[3] In this tribe, when a man dies, his brother may marry the widow or widows, provided he is chosen heir to the deceased; or if the brother is not heir, he may still receive from the heir one of the widows to wife. But except in these cases a man has no right to marry the widows of his deceased brother.[4] Thus it appears that among the Basoga the custom of the levirate is falling into decay.

The sororate among the Bagesu and Baganda.

The Bagesu, a Bantu tribe of Mount Elgon, in the Uganda Protectorate, practise polygamy, and a man is free to marry several sisters. A wife never objects to her husband marrying as many wives as he can afford to keep, whether they be her sisters or other women.[5] Among the Baganda, when a wife dies, her brother provides another sister to supply her place and marry the widower.[6]

The sororate and levirate among the Banyoro.

Among the Banyoro, another Bantu tribe of the Uganda Protectorate, there are no restrictions on a man's marrying

[1] C. W. Hobley, *Eastern Uganda, an Ethnological Survey* (London, 1902), pp. 17 *sq.*; Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate* (London, 1904), ii. 747; Max Weiss, *Die Völkerstämme im Norden Deutsch Ost-Afrikas* (Berlin, 1910), p. 226 (who calls these people Wageia).

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 282. Compare G. A. S. Northcote, "The Nilotic Kavirondo," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907) p. 62.

[3] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, p. 210.

[4] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 461, from information furnished by the Rev. John Roscoe. In his own book, subsequently published (*The Northern Bantu*, Cambridge, 1915), Mr. Roscoe has omitted this account of the succession to widows among the Basoga.

[5] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, pp. 173 *sq.*

[6] John Roscoe, "Worship of the Dead as practised by some African Tribes," *Harvard African Studies*, i. (Cambridge, 1917) p. 35.

several sisters; he may marry two or more sisters at the same time. Moreover, if his wife dies, especially in childbed, he expects her parents to furnish him with one of her sisters to replace the dead wife. Further, if his wife prove childless, he may demand one of her sisters in marriage, and in that case the barren wife may either remain with him or return to her parents, as she pleases. A man has not the right to marry his dead brother's widow, but he may do so if the clan appoints him heir to the deceased.[1] Thus among the Banyoro, while the sororate is practised in both forms, with the sisters of a living wife and with a deceased wife's sisters, the levirate appears to be falling into decay.

Among the Banyoro, according to one account, a man's widow is inherited by his son, and only in default of sons by his surviving brother. This rule, which gives the inheritance in the first place to sons, is probably an innovation on an older rule, which gave the inheritance first to brothers' and next to sisters' sons.

From an earlier account of customary law among the Banyoro we gather that in that tribe the right of a brother to marry his dead brother's wives has been to some extent superseded by the right of a son to marry his dead father's wives, always with the exception of his own mother. The account runs as follows: "Should the head of a house die without children, his brother inherits everything, even the wives; if there are several brothers, the younger ones receive small shares in goods and wives, according to the good pleasure of the eldest, who is the chief heir. When there are no brothers, the chief of the tribe inherits. But when there are sons, the eldest inherits all that is left by his father, the wives included, who, with the exception of his own mother, become his wives. The younger sons receive two women, two cows, and as much of the other property as the principal heir will give them."[2] From this it would appear that among the Banyoro a brother only succeeds to his dead brother's widows in default of sons, who, if there are any, enjoy a prior right. This succession of sons to the wives of their dead father is common in Africa;[3] but we can

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 522, from information furnished by the Rev. John Roscoe. This account of the sororate and levirate among the Banyoro has been omitted by Mr. Roscoe in *The Northern Bantu*. The practice of the sororate among the Banyoro is also attested by Emin Pasha. "If a man marries, and his wife falls ill and dies during a visit to her father's house, the husband either demands a wife—a sister of the deceased—in compensation, or receives two cows" (*Emin Pasha in Central Africa*, London, 1888, p. 86).

[2] *Emin Pasha in Central Africa* (London, 1888), p. 86.

[3] See above, vol. i. p. 541, note[3].

scarcely doubt that it is an innovation on older custom of the succession of brothers, which still survives in many parts of the continent. For it may be laid down as a general rule, that in the evolution of law the first heirs to be called to the succession are a man's brothers, the next his sister's sons,[1] and the last his own sons; since the recognition of physical paternity, with the rights and obligations which it confers and imposes, has been reached at a comparatively late date in the history of our species, whereas the recognition of maternity, which carries with it the perception of relationship to brothers and to sisters' sons, must derive from the very origin of human society. But once the relationship of fatherhood was clearly understood, it was natural that a father should desire to transmit his estate, including his wives, to the sons whom he had begotten and whom he justly regarded as in a real sense parts of himself, rather than to his brothers or his sisters' sons, with whom he now perceived that his relationship was more remote. Hence it has come about that in not a few African tribes the ancient custom of the levirate has given way to the more recent practice of passing on a dead man's wives to his own sons.

The sororate and the levirate among the Boloki and the Wabemba or Awemba.

Among the Boloki or Bangala, a Bantu tribe of the Upper Congo, a barren wife will take her sister to be a second wife to her husband, that he may have a child by her.[2] Among the Wabemba or Awemba, a Bantu tribe of the Congo Free State and North-Eastern Rhodesia, the sororate is practised both in the lifetime and after the death of the first sister. When a man's wife dies, he has the right to marry her younger sister, if she is still unmarried. Should the girl be under puberty, her father will send her to the widower along with a nubile female slave, who will replace her until she is

[1] For example, among most of the tribes of the Gaboon investigated by Du Chaillu, a man's heirs were his brothers, and only in default of brothers did the eldest son of the eldest sister inherit. Only in one of the tribes known to Du Chaillu (the Bakalai) did sons inherit the property of their fathers. See Paul B. du Chaillu, *Journey to Ashango-land* (London, 1867), p. 429. Similarly, among the Kunamas, on the borders of Abyssinia, a man's widow is married by his brother; but if the deceased left no brother, his widow is taken to wife by his sister's son. See Werner Munzinger, *Ost-afrikanische Studien* (Schaffhausen, 1864), p. 488.

[2] John H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals* (London, 1913), p. 130.

"Taking the death off the body" of a widower.

old enough to marry her brother-in-law, the widower. But if all his deceased wife's sisters are married, the widower sends a present to the husband of his late wife's younger sister, and the woman is ceded to him by her husband for one or two nights, in order that by cohabiting with him she may, as the phrase runs, "take the death off his body." Unless she performed this ceremony, the widower could never marry again; no woman would have him. When the death has thus been "taken off his body," he returns the woman to her husband and looks out for another wife; but before he can marry her, he must appease the spirit of his dead wife by scraping with his fingers a little hole at the head of the grave and filling it with beer, doubtless to slake the thirst of the ghost. Further, when a wife has grown old and her husband is still comparatively young and vigorous, it is customary for the wife to go to her father and obtain from him her younger sister, whom she brings to her husband as a second wife. If she has no sister, she will probably procure a niece to take her place; but she herself is not divorced, the two sisters are wives simultaneously of the same man. Further, the Wabemba practise the levirate; for when a man dies, his eldest brother or, in his default, the son of the eldest brother, inherits the property and the wives of the deceased. And the heir, whether he be the brother of the deceased or another kinsman, must "take the death off the body" of his predecessor's widow by cohabiting with her. Even if he declines to marry her, he is still obliged to "take the death off her body" in this manner before the woman is free to marry any one else. Should the woman refuse to marry her late husband's brother or other heir, and to let him "take the death off her body," she would be pointed out as an adulteress and accused of having caused the death of her former husband. It would be considered unlucky for any one else to marry her, for the ghost of her dead husband would be supposed to haunt or kill any one who married her.[1] Thus among the Wabemba

"Taking the death off the body" of a widow to rid her of her husband's ghost.

[1] Charles Delhaise, *Notes Ethnographiques sur quelques peuplades du Tanganika* (Brussels, 1905), pp. 18 *sq.*; Cullen Gouldsbury and Hubert Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Nigeria* (London, 1911), pp. 171 *sq.*; J. C. C. Coxhead, *The Native Tribes of Northern Rhodesia, their Laws and Customs* (London, 1914), pp. 9 *sq.*, 15. I have ventured to assume the identity of the Wabemba of the Congo Free State with the Awemba of North-

or Awemba the cohabitation of the heir with the widow would seem to be intended to rid her of the jealous ghost of her departed spouse, who might otherwise haunt or kill his living rival. The cohabitation of the deceased wife's sister with the widower in this tribe is probably designed in like manner to relieve him from the unwelcome attentions of his late wife's wraith.

The sororate among the Hausas and the tribes of the French Sudan.

Among the Hausas a Mohammedan may marry a younger sister after the death of her elder sister, his wife, but he may not marry an elder sister after the death of a younger.[1] In harmony with this is the rule, reported by one Hausa informant, that during his wife's lifetime a man should avoid meeting her elder but not her younger sister;[2] for the discrimination which he thus makes between the sisters probably springs from the consideration that he may one day marry the younger but never the elder. We have seen that in the Thonga tribe of South Africa a man discriminates in the same way between his wife's elder and younger sisters and for the same reason. In the French Sudan, where wives are generally bought, a reduction in the price used sometimes to be made when a man married several sisters. For example, among the Nounoumas a man got a second sister for one-fifth less than he paid for the first; and if he chose to marry the third sister, he got her for nothing.[3] Among the Menkieras the calculation of the relative value of the sisters is rather more intricate. A husband who had married an elder sister might afterwards marry her second sister on paying only four head of cattle instead of five, which was the price he had paid for his first

Eastern Rhodesia, partly on account of the similarity of the names, but still more on account of the close resemblance of their marriage customs, which in some respects amounts to identity; the account given by Messrs. Goulds-bury and Sheane of the Awemba customs might almost be a translation of the account which Delhaise gives of the Wabemba customs. That the widower actually cohabits with his deceased wife's married sister is not expressly affirmed by Delhaise; but his words seem clearly to imply it.

[1] A. J. N. Tremearne, *The Ban of the Bori* (London, [1914]), p. 121.

[2] A. J. N. Tremearne, *The Ban of the Bori*, p. 124. According to another of Major Tremearne's informants, a man should avoid both the elder and the younger sisters of his wife in her lifetime; and Major Tremearne thinks this account the more likely. For the reason indicated in the text I am inclined to accept the other account as the more probable.

[3] Louis Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), p. 139.

wife. If he afterwards married a third sister, there was no reduction in price; but if he married a fourth sister, he again got an abatement of one head of cattle out of five. At the present day the relative price of sisters in the tribe is the same, but it is now paid in cowries instead of in cattle.[1]

The sororate and levirate in Madagascar.

From the foregoing survey it appears that both the sororate and the levirate are characteristic institutions of the Bantu stock, while the sororate is found among the Nilotic tribes of Kavirondo and the black races of the Sudan. In Madagascar, the native population of which belongs to the Malayan or Indonesian and not to the African stock, it is said to be customary for a man to receive, along with his wife, her younger sisters in marriage,[2] but the statement lacks confirmation. However, if it is doubtful whether the sororate was customary in Madagascar, it is certain that the levirate was so. The widow formed part of her husband's inheritance, and his eldest surviving brother had the right to marry her, but should he abstain from exercising his right, he was bound formally to repudiate her before she might marry again. If the deceased left no brother, his widow went to a nephew or cousin, as it was deemed very desirable to keep the property within the family. Also when a man died childless it was held to be very important that his widow should have offspring by a kinsman, and the children begotten by him on her were reputed, as in ancient Israel, the children of the dead man.[3]

Among the Kafirs younger brothers may not marry before the eldest.

Before quitting Africa to turn to Asia, it may be well to note that the Thonga and Bechuana rule, which forbids a younger sister to marry before an elder sister, has its parallel in a Kafir rule which forbids younger brothers to marry before their eldest brother. Among the Kafirs, we are told, it is "a common custom not to allow any younger brother to marry until his elder brother has at least one wife. The reason of

[1] Louis Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan*, p. 95.

[2] Th. Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (Leipsic, 1860–1877), ii. 438. The view that the bulk of the Malagasy are of African origin, though it has been held by many writers, appears to be erroneous. See A. et G. Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, i. (Paris, 1908), pp. 1 *sqq.* (*Histoire Physique, Naturelle et Politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv.).

[3] A. et G. Grandidier, *Ethnographie de Madagascar*, ii. (Paris, 1914), pp. 240 *sq.*

this is very simple. A father usually helps his sons to marry, giving them a number of cattle to pay as dowry. If a younger brother married first he might do an injustice to the elder brother, who might not be able to get help from his father. But once the elder brother has one wife the other brothers may marry as soon as they like, and may buy as many wives as they wish."[1] The parallelism with the custom which forbids a younger sister to marry before her elder sister suggests a doubt whether this simple economic motive suffices to explain the rule. To this point we shall return later on.

The rule which enjoins both brothers and sisters to marry in order of seniority is commonly observed in India.

Whatever may be the true explanation of the rule which enjoins both brothers and sisters to marry in order of seniority, the custom in its application to both sexes appears to be generally observed in India. Thus with regard to the various peoples of the Punjab we read that, "when the children live under the protection of the father or some other guardian, the custom regarding the order in which they are married is that the sons are generally married in the order of seniority, *i.e.* the eldest being married first and the youngest last. Similarly in the case of daughters, the eldest must be married before the next younger sister. In the absence of special reasons, it is considered a disgrace to marry the younger son or daughter before the elder one. So far, the custom is general amongst the Hindus, Muhammadans, and Sikhs. Exceptions are only made when, owing to some physical defect or for other reasons, it is not possible to find a match for the elder son or daughter, while a suitable alliance can be arranged for a younger member to the advantage of one or both parties, if contracted without delay. The younger son or daughter is also sometimes married before the elder, if convenient, provided that the elder son or daughter has been betrothed. Amongst the Hindus, the rule has been to marry all children, *i.e.* both boys and girls in the order of seniority, and a score of years ago no one would accept the hand of a girl if her elder brother remained unmarried. The age of marriage for boys

[1] Dudley Kidd, *The Essential Kafir* (London, 1904), p. 211. The same rule, with the same explanation, is recorded by the Rev. H. H. Dugmore in Col. Maclean's *Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs* (Cape Town, 1866), p. 45.

is, however, being raised gradually, and consequently the objection to the younger sister being married before the elder brother is losing its force. Among the Muhammadans and Sikhs generally, the marriageable age of boys being higher, the marriage of girls is not put off in favour of the elder boys. When sons grow independent of the father, or if the brothers separate at the death of the father, they marry at their own discretion, usually without regard to precedence by birth."[1] Among the Santals of Bengal "the custom is to marry the young folks according to their ages, and it is very seldom that a younger is married before an elder. Should a younger sister be married before an elder, the latter claims a solatium known as *taṛam gaṇḍe*, which amounts to about two rupees."[2]

Ancient Indian law strictly enjoined brothers and sisters to marry in order of seniority.

Among the Aryans of India this custom of marrying both sons and daughters strictly in the order of seniority is very ancient. In the *Laws of Manu*, a curious jumble of law, religion, and metaphysics, which in its present form may date from about the second century of our era,[3] we read that "the elder brother who marries after the younger, the younger brother who marries before the elder, the female with whom such a marriage is contracted, he who gives her away, and the sacrificing priest, as the fifth, all fall into hell."[4] An older code of law, which bears the name of Baudhâyana, and may perhaps date from the sixth or fifth century before our era, is more merciful; for while it acknowledges that all these five sinners naturally "sink to a region of torment," it holds out to them the hope of escaping this dreadful doom by the simple performance of a penance proportioned to the gravity of their offence, the male culprits being sentenced to a penance of twelve days, and the female offender to a fast of three days.[5] It will be

[1] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. xiv. *Punjab*, Part i. *Report*, by Pandit Harikishan Kaul (Lahore, 1912), p. 268.

[2] Hon. and Rev. A. Campbell, D.D., "Santal Marriage Customs," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, ii. (Bankipore, 1916) p. 308.

[3] *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Empire of India* (Oxford, 1909), i. 332, 334, ii. 262.

[4] *The Laws of Manu*, iii. 172, p. 108 of G. Bühler's translation (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv., Oxford, 1886).

[5] *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, translated by G. Bühler, Part ii. (Oxford, 1882) p. 217 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiv.). As to the date of Baudhâyana's code, see G. Bühler's Introduction, p. xliii; also

observed that while the penalty of damnation is thus denounced against the sinner who marries before his elder brother, nothing is said about the fate of him who marries a younger before an elder sister. However, a felon of the latter sort by no means escaped scot-free. The code which goes by the name of Vasishtha lays down the rules to be followed for the repression of all such offences against the order of nature. An elder brother who suffers a younger brother to wed before him is to perform a penance and marry the woman. The younger brother who married before his elder brother is to perform a double penance, to give up his wife to his elder brother, marry again, and then take back the woman whom he had married first. A man who marries a younger before an elder sister is to perform a penance for twelve days and then to marry the elder sister. A man who marries an elder sister after her younger sister is to perform a double penance, give up his wife to the husband of the younger sister, and marry again.[1] Another Indian code, which passes under the name of Vishnu and seems to be not earlier than the beginning of the third century of our era, prescribes a uniform penance for "an unmarried elder brother whose younger brother is married, a younger brother married before the elder, an unmarried elder sister whose younger sister is married, the relative who gives such a damsel in marriage, and the priest who officiates at such a marriage."[2]

The custom of marrying in order of seniority still observed among the South Slavs.

The ancient Aryan custom recorded in these Indian lawbooks is still to a certain extent followed by the South Slavs, who have preserved many relics of early law and usage which have long vanished among the Western nations of Europe. "Serbian custom requires that the eldest son should marry before his younger brothers. A single exception is admitted for the case in which he renounces marriage,

his Introduction to *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, Part i. (Oxford, 1879) pp. xxii, xliii (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii.).

[1] *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, translated by G. Bühler, Part ii. (Oxford, 1882) p. 103 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiv.). The date of the laws of Vasishtha is uncertain. The translator thinks that it is not "comparatively late" (Introduction, p. xxvi), from which we may perhaps infer that it is not later than the beginning of the Christian era.

[2] *The Institutes of Vishnu*, translated by Julius Jolly (Oxford, 1880), p. 177 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. vii.). As to the date of this work, see *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), ii. 262.

either voluntarily or compulsorily, by reason of some bodily infirmity; but he must expressly give his brother permission to marry. The daughters always precede their brothers in marriage. However, when one of the sisters is married, and the other still a child, the brother is not obliged to wait till his younger sister is nubile. The same order is rigorously observed in Bulgaria. A man who should violate it would be severely excluded from the community."[1] Even in our own country a reminiscence of the old rule seems to survive in the custom which prescribes that when a younger sister marries before her elder sisters these damsels should all dance at the wedding barefoot or at least without shoes: "this will counteract their ill-luck, and procure them husbands."[2] The custom is alluded to by Shakespeare,[3] and appears to be still observed in Shropshire and the north of England.[4] In Wales, "if the youngest of a family was married before the eldest, the seniors had to dance shoeless for penance to the company."[5] From this it appears that elder brothers had also to dance without shoes at the weddings of their younger brothers. In the west of England the rule is said to be that at the wedding of a younger sister the elder sister should dance in green stockings.[6] Apparently in some parts of Scotland the custom was similar, for there is a saying that when a girl marries before her elder sisters "she has given them green stockings."[7] In the north-east of Scotland a younger sister on such an occasion gave her elder sister green garters,[8] in which we may suppose that the elder was formerly expected to dance at her younger

Reminiscences of the custom in England and Scotland.

[1] F. Demelić, *Le Droit Coutumier des Slaves Méridionaux d'après les recherches de M. V. Bogišić* (Paris, 1877), p. 52.

[2] Francis Grose, *A Provincial Glossary, with a Collection of Local Proverbs and Popular Superstitions* (London, 1811), p. 293; J. Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain* (London, 1882–1883), ii. 169.

[3] *The Taming of the Shrew*, Act II, Scene i, line 33, where Katharina says of her younger sister, Bianca, "I must dance bare-foot on her wedding-day."

[4] Miss C. S. Burne and Miss G. F. Jackson, *Shropshire Folk-lore* (London, 1883), pp. 290 *sq.*; W. Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders* (London, 1879), p. 41.

[5] Marie Trevelyan, *Folk-lore and Folk-stories of Wales* (London, 1909), p. 274.

[6] R. Chambers, *The Book of Days* (London, 1886), i. 723.

[7] Robert Chambers, *Popular Rhymes of Scotland* (London and Edinburgh, N.D.), p. 342.

[8] Walter Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the North-East of Scotland* (London, 1881), p. 90.

sister's wedding. Among the mining folk of Fife at a marriage "a dance would be held and 'the green garters' (which had been knitted in anticipation by the best maid) were pinned surreptitiously on to the clothing of the elder unmarried brother or sister of the bride. When discovered they were removed and tied round the left arm and worn for the rest of the evening. The green garters are still in evidence."[1] The use of green for the stockings or garters of the elder sister on such occasions is all the more remarkable because, in general green is thought a very unlucky colour at marriage. Down to the present time in the north of Scotland no young woman would wear green on her wedding-day; and we hear of an old lady who attributed all her misfortunes in life to her imprudence in being married in a green gown instead of a blue.[2] The prejudice against green at weddings is equally strong in Yorkshire; a bride who was rash enough to be married in green is said to have contracted a severe illness in consequence; and in that part of the country a bridal dress of blue is thought to be very little better, for they say, "If dressed in blue, she's sure to rue."[3] It is a popular saying in Shropshire and Suffolk that an elder unmarried brother or sister should dance at his or her younger brother's or sister's wedding in a hog's trough.[4] In the year 1881 a man in the Bridgenorth neighbourhood was heard to observe gravely, with reference to the marriage of the second son of the local squire, that Mr. M—— (the elder brother, still unmarried) would have to dance in a pig-trough on the wedding-day.[5] In Yorkshire there is a saying that an unmarried elder brother or sister must dance "in the half-peck" at the marriage of his or her younger brother

[1] D. Rorie, M.D., in *County Folk-lore*, vii. *Fife*, collected by J. E. Simpkins (London, 1914), p. 393. Green garters seem to have been similarly used at weddings in Lincolnshire. See *County Folk-lore*, vol. v. *Lincolnshire*, by Mrs. Gutch and Mabel Peacock (London, 1908), p. 232, compare p. 233.

[2] Robert Chambers, *Popular Rhymes of Scotland*, p. 342.

[3] *County Folk-lore*, vol. ii. *North Riding of Yorkshire, York and Ainsty*, collected by Mrs. Gutch (London, 1901), p. 290; *County Folk-lore*, vol. vi. *East Riding of Yorkshire*, by Mrs. Gutch (London, 1912), p. 128.

[4] Elizabeth Mary Wright, *Rustic Speech and Folk-lore* (Oxford University Press, 1913), p. 276. Compare Robert Chambers, *The Book of Days*, i. 723.

[5] Miss C. S. Burne and Miss G. F. Jackson, *Shropshire Folk-lore* (London, 1883), p. 291.

or sister.[1] We have seen, too, that among the mining folk of Fife an elder unmarried brother has to wear green garters, apparently as a badge of infamy, at the marriage of his younger sister. At Ventron, in the Vosges, a girl who marries before her elder sisters must give them a white goat; but the demand of justice is generally satisfied with a goat cut out of wood or of cardboard or simply of turnip.[2] Thus popular custom in England, Scotland, and France still reflects that prejudice against the marriage of younger before elder children which is recorded in the ancient lawbooks of India.

Reminiscence of the custom in France.

Marriage of children in order of seniority in China, the East Indies, and Africa.

The Chinese also are wont to marry their children in order of seniority;[3] and in China the bridal chair which is carried at marriage processions is frequently decorated with a pair of trousers hung over the door. This singular ornament is explained as follows. "It would appear that if a man marries before his elder brother, or a woman before her elder sister, it is the correct thing to hang this article of clothing both over the door of the house where the marriage takes place and over that of the bride's chair. The trowsers represent the elder brother and sister."[4] We may conjecture that the intention is to hold up the old bachelor or old maid to public derision, which after all is a lighter penalty than that of damnation denounced by the *Laws of Manu* against unmarried elder brothers. The modern Javanese and the modern Egyptians are also reluctant to marry their daughters except in the order of seniority.[5] Among the Bataks of Sumatra a younger brother may not marry before an elder brother.[6] In the East Indian island of Halmahera a younger sister may not marry before an elder sister,[7] and

[1] Elizabeth Mary Wright, *Rustic Speech and Folk-lore* (Oxford University Press, 1913), p. 276.

[2] L. F. Sauvé, *Le Folk-lore des Hautes-Vosges* (Paris, 1889), p. 98.

[3] J. H. Gray, *China* (London, 1878), i. 190.

[4] *The China Review*, vol. i. (Hong-Kong, July 1872–June 1873), p. 272.

[5] C. F. Winter, "Instellingen gewoonten en gebruiken der Javanen te Soerakarta," *Tijdschrift voor Neêrlands Indie*, Vijfde Jaargang, Eerste Deel (Batavia, 1843), p. 566; E. W. Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (Paisley and London, 1895), p. 172.

[6] G. A. Wilken, "Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), i. 450 *sq.*

[7] J. G. F. Riedel, "Galela und Tobeloresen," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xvii. (1885) p. 76.

the same rule applies to sisters in the island of Nias, a departure from the rule being permitted only when the elder sister, by reason of chronic ill-health, deformity, or other bodily defect, is not likely to find a suitor.[1] Among the Toboongkoos and Tomoris of Central Celebes, when a young man asks the hand of a girl whose elder sister is still unmarried, her father urges him to marry the elder sister first; but if the suitor will not hear of it, he must pay the elder sister or sisters a fine for marrying their younger sister before them. Should the suitor be rich, he will have to give each of the slighted damsels a slave or four buffaloes; should he be poor, the amount of the fine will be proportionately less.[2] Fines for similar transgressions of what is deemed the natural order of marriage are exacted from bridegrooms among some of the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes.[3] Similarly in some parts of Sumatra a man is allowed to marry a younger before an elder sister on payment of a small sum of money to the elder sister or her mother.[4] Among the Sangos of German East Africa a younger sister ought not to marry before her elder sister, and she may not do so unless the elder is more than twenty years old and has no prospect of finding a husband.[5] We have seen that a similar custom of precedence accorded to elder sisters in marriage is observed by other African tribes, the Thonga and Bechuanas.[6]

The sororate in modern India: rule that a younger sister may not marry before an elder.

In India at the present day the custom of the sororate is common, and sometimes it is expressly laid down that the elder sister must be married before the younger. Thus among the Assamese a man may marry two sisters, but he must marry

[1] J. T. Nieuwenhuisen en H. C. B. von Rosenberg, "Verslag omtrent het eiland Nias," *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, xxx. (Batavia, 1863), p. 39; H. von Rosenberg, *Der Malayische Archipel* (Leipsic, 1878), p. 155.

[2] A. C. Kruijt, "Eenige ethnografische aanteekeningen omtrent de Toboengkoe en de Tomori," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, xliv. (1900) p. 234.

[3] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), ii. 16.

[4] William Marsden, *History of Sumatra* (London, 1811), p. 229; G. A. Wilken, "Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel," *De verspreide Geschriften*, i. 451.

[5] Missionar Heese, "Sitte und Brauch der Sango," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.F., xii. (1913) p. 134.

[6] See above, p. 277.

the elder before the younger.[1] Among the Garos of Assam the custom is the same.[2] So in the Uppara caste of Mysore, two sisters may be taken in marriage by the same man, provided that he does not marry the younger before the elder sister. But while the Upparas allow the sororate, they forbid the levirate, in other words, they do not allow a widow to marry her deceased husband's brother.[3] Other castes of Mysore allow a man to marry several sisters in their lifetime, sometimes simultaneously; but where he is only permitted to marry them successively, we may surmise that he has to observe the custom enjoined by the Upparas of marrying the elder before the younger sister.[4] For example, among the Nagartas "two sisters may be married by one man but at different times, especially when the first wife is barren or is suffering from an incurable disease; and to avoid the quarrels in the family if a stranger girl is married, the sister of the living wife is preferred."[5] So among the Kurubas of North Arcot a man may marry two sisters either on the death of one of them, or if his first wife is childless or suffers from an incurable disease.[6] Similarly, among the Medaras of Southern India marriage with two living sisters is common, especially when one of the wives is diseased; and marriage with a deceased wife's sister is regarded with special favour.[7] The Kachhis, an important caste of cultivators in the Central Provinces, allow a man to have two sisters as wives at the same time; indeed at their weddings a piece of pantomime is enacted which seems to indicate a preference for marriage with two sisters simultaneously. At a certain point of the ceremony the bride is hidden somewhere in the house, and the bridegroom has to search for her. Sometimes the bride's younger sister is dressed up in the bride's clothes, and the bridegroom catches her in mistake for his wife; whereupon

[1] *A Sketch of Assam, with some Account of the Hill Tribes*, by an Officer [John Butler] (London, 1847), p. 142.

[2] Major A. Playfair, *The Garos* (London, 1909), p. 69.

[3] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxi. *Uppára Caste* (Bangalore, 1910), pp. 4, 7.

[4] H. V. Nanjundayya, *op. cit.* ii. *Holeya Caste*, p. 7; *id.* ix. *Tigala Caste*, p. 3; *id.* xiii. *Dombar Caste*, p. 5; *id.* xv. *Morasu Okkalu*, p. 13; *id.* xvi. *Sanyasi Caste*, p. 2.

[5] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, xxx. *Nagartás* (Bangalore, 1913), p. 6.

[6] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), iv. 147.

[7] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. 55.

the old women laugh and say to him, "Do you want her also?"[1] In some castes, however, a man may not have two sisters to wife at the same time, but is free to marry the second sister after the death of the first. Thus among the Sunars, who are the goldsmiths and silversmiths of the Central Provinces, "a man is forbidden to marry two sisters while both are alive, and after his wife's death he may espouse her younger sister, but not her elder one."[2] So, too, among the Oswals, a wealthy and respectable trading class of the North-Western Provinces, a man may marry his deceased wife's younger sister, but is forbidden to marry her elder sister.[3]

The sororate and the levirate practised in conjunction in modern India.

In India the custom of the sororate is very commonly practised in conjunction with the levirate. Thus among the Veddas of Ceylon "second marriages are, and always have been frequent, a man often marrying a sister of his deceased wife and a woman marrying one of her dead husband's brothers. We believe that such unions were regarded as both a privilege and a duty, though according to Handuna of Sitala Wanniya a man married his dead wife's sister principally because if he married any one else his children would not be looked after so well."[4]

The Veddas.

The Besthas.

The Besthas, a large caste of Mysore, do not allow a man to be married to two sisters at the same time, but they permit him to marry the one after the death of the other; indeed a deceased wife's sister is generally preferred as a second wife. Further, a widow may marry her deceased husband's elder brother, but such marriages are rare.[5]

The Saoras.

Among the Saoras, a tribe of industrious cultivators inhabiting a rugged mountainous region in northern Madras, it is said to be common for a man to marry his wife's sister in the lifetime of the first, and the two sisters so married live together until a child is born, after which they must separate; for each wife has a separate house and a separate patch of ground to till on the

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), iii. 286 *sq.*

[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iv. 520.

[3] W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Calcutta, 1896), iv. 99. The prohibition to marry two sisters in the lifetime of both is here rather implied than expressed.

[4] C. G. Seligmann and Brenda Z. Seligmann, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 69.

[5] H. V. Nanjundayya, *The Ethnographical Survey of Mysore*, v. *Bestha Caste* (Bangalore, 1906), pp. 4, 8.

hill-side. A widow is bound to marry her late husband's younger brother; if he is too young to wed, she waits till he is grown up. If her deceased husband has no younger brothers living, she marries a son of one of his brothers. A reason assigned for marrying a wife's sister is that the marriage is inexpensive; probably she is to be had cheaper than another woman. Thus with the Saoras, as with many other peoples, the passion of love tends to flow in the channel of economy.[1] Among the Ahirs, a large caste of cowherds and milkmen in the Central Provinces, a man may marry his wife's younger but not her elder sister, while his first wife is still living; and a widow is often expected to marry her deceased husband's younger brother.[2] The Kawars, a primitive hill tribe of the Central Provinces, observe similar customs. A man may not marry his wife's elder sister, but he can take her younger sister to wife in the lifetime of his first wife; and the marriage of a widow with her late husband's younger brother is deemed the most suitable match.[3] So with the Telis, a large caste of oil-pressers in the Central Provinces, a man may marry his wife's younger sister while she herself is alive, but he may never marry her elder sister. In Chhattisgarh a Teli widow is always kept in the family, if it can be done; and when her late husband's brother is only a boy, she is sometimes induced to put on the bangles and wait for him. In Chanda, on the other hand, some Telis do not permit a widow to marry her deceased husband's younger brother at all, and others allow the marriage only when he is a bachelor or a widower.[4] The Korkus, a Munda or Kolarian tribe of the Central Provinces, practise polygamy on a very liberal scale, a husband sometimes having twelve wives all living at one time. But he "must not marry his wife's younger sister if she is the widow of a member of his own sept nor his elder brother's widow if she is his wife's elder sister."[5] This implies that he may marry his wife's younger sister, if she is not the

The Ahirs.

The Kawars.

The Telis.

The Korkus.

[1] Fred. Fawcett, "On the Saoras (or Savaras), an aboriginal Hill People of the Eastern Ghats of the Madras Presidency," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, i. (Bombay, 1886–1887) pp. 230 *sq.*, 234 *sq.*

[2] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), ii. 26, 27.

[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 393, 395.

[4] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iv. 547, 548.

[5] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 559.

widow of a member of his own sept; and that he may marry his elder brother's widow, provided that she is not his wife's elder sister. The Gonds of the Central Provinces appear to practise the sororate with the usual restriction; for we are told that among them "a man cannot marry his wife's elder sister,"[1] which implies that he can marry her younger sister. They commonly observe the levirate also with the usual limitation, for we read that, while the re-marriage of a widow is freely permitted, "as a rule it is considered suitable that she should marry her deceased husband's younger brother, but she may not marry his elder brother, and in the south of Bastar and Chānda the union with the younger brother is also prohibited. In Mandla, if she will not wed the younger brother, on the eleventh day after the husband's death he puts the *tarkhi* or palm-leaf ear-rings in her ears, and states that if she marries anybody else he will claim *dawa-bunda* or compensation. Similarly in Bastar, if an outsider marries the widow, he first goes through a joint ceremony with the younger brother, by which the latter relinquishes his right in favour of the former."[2] Among the Ramaiyas, a pedlar class of the North-Western Provinces, a man may not have two sisters to wife at the same time, but there is no rule against his marrying his deceased wife's younger sister; and a widow may marry her deceased husband's younger brother, if he is unmarried. Should her brother-in-law not claim her hand, she is free to bestow it upon somebody else.[3] Among the Hindoos of the Punjab a man who has married an elder sister will seldom marry her younger sister in the lifetime of the first; but when the elder sister dies, he will often take her younger sister to wife. Indeed, among ruling chiefs, instances of two sisters being given in marriage at the same time to the same man are not uncommon. In those castes of the Punjab which permit a woman to marry again, she must be taken to wife by her deceased husband's

The Gonds.

The Ramaiyas.

The Hindoos of the Punjab.

[1] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 72.

[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 80 *sq.* Compare Captain J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India* (London, 1871), p. 150, "Among the Gónds it is even the duty of a younger brother to take to wife the widow of an elder. The converse is not, however, permitted."

[3] W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Calcutta, 1896), iv. 224.

brother. Contrary to the usual rule, there is no objection to her wedding her dead husband's elder brother; but if there is a younger brother, a union with him is deemed preferable.[1]

The sororate and the levirate among the tribes of Assam.

Among the inhabitants of the hills near Rajamahall a man is free to marry his wife's sisters and the widow of his elder brother.[2] Among the Kacharis of Assam "a widower may marry his deceased wife's younger sister, but not the elder, whom he is taught to regard conventionally in the light of a mother. Much the same principle holds good in the case of the re-marriage of widows, which is freely permitted, the one limitation being that a widow may marry her deceased husband's younger brother, but not the elder."[3] So among the Kachcha Nagas, in the North Cachar Hills, "the younger brother may marry the deceased elder brother's wife, but not the widow of a younger brother. A man may marry his wife's younger sister, but not the elder."[4] With the Kuki-Lushai tribes of the same region the rules are similar. "A man, if not already married, is bound to marry the widow of a deceased elder brother. Even if he be a mere child, he will, on coming of age, marry the woman, however old she may be. An elder brother may not marry the widow of the younger. A man may marry his wife's younger sister, but not the elder."[5]

Distinction in respect of marriageability between elder and younger brothers and sisters.

Thus many Indian castes or tribes draw a sharp distinction in respect of marriageability between the elder and the younger sisters of a wife, and between the elder and younger brothers of a husband: in the one case a man may marry his wife's younger but not her elder sister, in the other case a woman may marry her deceased husband's younger but not his elder brother. The reasons for such distinctions of age will be discussed later on.

The customs of the sororate and the levirate are observed

[1] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. xiv. *Punjab*, Part i. *Report*, by Pandit Harikshan Kaul (Lahore, 1912), pp. 289 *sq.*

[2] Lieutenant Thomas Shaw, "On the Inhabitants of the Hills near Rajamahall," *Asiatic Researches*, iv. (London, 1807), pp. 59, 60.

[3] Sidney Endle, *The Kachâris* (London, 1911), p. 29.

[4] C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kachcha Nâga (Empêo) Tribe in the North Cachar Hills* (Shillong, 1885), p. 8.

[5] C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes on the North-East Frontier* (Shillong, 1887), pp. 15 *sq.*

The sororate and the levirate among other Asiatic peoples.

by other Asiatic peoples. Thus in Siam a man is allowed to marry two sisters, either simultaneously or successively; but if he has married the younger sister first, he may not afterward marry the elder.[1] Among the Rodes, a savage tribe of hunters in the mountains of Cambodia, polygamy is in vogue, and a man who has married the eldest daughter of a family has an acknowledged right to marry all her younger sisters; they may not wed any one else without his consent.[2] Among the Kachins, Chingpaws, or Singphos of Upper Burma "polygamy is permissible. For a man to have more than two wives is rare. Sometimes, however, he cannot help himself, since successive brothers must marry a deceased elder brother's widows. Occasionally, when many brothers die and one brother is saddled with more wives than he is able to support, it is permissible to arrange for a still younger brother or even a stranger to take the widow; the widow in any case has to be taken care of and fed by her husband's family even if none of them will formally become her husband."[3] Among the Kamchadales a man often married two sisters either at the same time or one after the death of the other; and when a husband died, his surviving brother married the widow, whether he already had a wife or not.[4] With the Koryaks of North-Eastern Siberia it is a rule that a man may not marry the sister of his living wife, but on the other hand he is obliged to marry his deceased wife's younger sister, though he is forbidden to marry her elder sister. Similarly, a Koryak widow is bound to marry her deceased husband's younger brother, but is forbidden to marry his elder brother.[5] The heathen Ostiaks marry as many wives as they can afford to keep, and they prefer to take several

[1] Turpin, "History of Siam," in John Pinkerton's *General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1808–1814), ix. 585; E. Aymonier, *Notes sur le Laos* (Saigon, 1885), p. 268.

[2] J. Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge* (Paris, 1883), i. 426, 427, 428.

[3] (Sir) J. George Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States* (Rangoon, 1900–1901), Part i. vol. i. p. 405; compare *id.* p. 407, "A widow, as has been noted, is usually taken by her husband's brothers. She has no option and can only marry again outside her husband's household with their consent." Compare also John Anderson, *Mandalay to Momien* (London, 1867), p. 142.

[4] G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka* (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1774), p. 347.

[5] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (Leyden and New York, 1908), pp. 737, 748. (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vi. *Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History, New York.*)

sisters to wife, not only because they deem marriage with a wife's sister lucky, but also because they get the subsequent sisters at half price, a large reduction being made by the father of the girls to the man who takes a number of them off his hands. Further, an Ostiak may lawfully wed his deceased brother's widow.[1]

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister among the Cheremiss and Mordvins of Russia.

The heathen Cheremiss of Russia practise polygamy, and though they may not marry two sisters at the same time, they are pleased to marry them one after the other.[2] Among the Mordvins of Russia the practice of marrying a deceased wife's sister was common as late as the eighteenth century. Indeed, we are told that the widower had a right to the hand of the lady, and if her father refused his consent, the importunate suitor could extort it by the following ceremony. Snatching a morsel of bread from the bin, he would lay it on the table and run away, crying, "Behold the bread and salt! Watch over my betrothed." After that his father-in-law could no longer withhold from him the hand of his second daughter.[3]

The sororate and levirate in the Indian Archipelago.

Among the Bataks of Sumatra, if a wife dies childless, her husband has the right to marry her sisters successively, one after the other, without having to pay another bride-price for them to the parents; if the parents refuse their consent to the new marriage, the widower may demand the restitution of the price he paid for his first wife.[4] Further, it is a rule of Batak law that on a man's death his wives pass with his property to his heir, who is his younger brother or eldest son. If the brother desires to marry them, the women have no right to refuse; but if he will not have them, it is open to them to marry other men. If, at the time of her husband's death, his younger brother is under age, the widows must wait for him till he is grown up.[5] But while a Batak woman

[1] P. S. Pallas, *Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des Russischen Reichs* (St. Petersburg, 1771–1776), iii. 51.

[2] J. G. Georgi, *Beschreibung aller Nationen des Russischen Reichs* (St. Petersburg, 1776–1780), i. 31.

[3] Jean N. Smirnov, *Les Populations Finnoises des bassins de la Volga et de la Kama*, Première Partie (Paris, 1898), p. 340.

[4] C. J. Temminck, *Coup d'œil général sur les possessions Néerlandaises dans l'Inde Archipélagique* (Leyden, 1847), ii. 55; F. Warneck, "Das Eherecht bei den Toba-Batak," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, liii. (1901), p. 535.

[5] J. B. Neumann, "Het Pane- en Bilastroomgebied op het eiland Sumatra," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch*

is bound to marry her deceased husband's younger brother, if he will have her, she is forbidden to marry his elder brother; such a union is regarded as incest, and is punished by killing the culprits and devouring their bodies.[1] The Menangkabaw Malays of Sumatra regard it as a meritorious deed when a man marries his deceased wife's sister or his deceased brother's widow, because in this way the bond between the families is not broken by death.[2] In the island of Engano, to the south-west of Sumatra, a widower usually marries his deceased wife's sister; but if he fails to do so, he has not to pay a fine for culpable negligence.[3] In the Mansela and Nusawele districts of Ceram a man may lawfully marry two wives, but the men who avail themselves of this privilege are not numerous. However, in the comparatively rare cases of polygamy the wives are nearly always sisters, and the custom is defended on the ground that if the wives were not sisters, there would be constant bickering in the house.[4]

The sororate and levirate in the Western Islands of Torres Straits, New Guinea, and the Lousiades.

The natives of the Western Islands of Torres Straits observed both the sororate and the levirate. Among them, when a man married a second wife, either in the lifetime of his first wife or after her death, he commonly espoused her sister (*tukoiab*). But the sister need not be a full sister in our sense, since the native term for sister (*tukoiab*) is used in the classificatory or group sense of the term, so as to include half-sisters and certain first and second cousins. However, in a considerable proportion of the recorded cases the second wives whom a man married were the own sisters of his first wife. In regard to the levirate, a widow among these people was not compelled to marry her deceased husband's brother,

Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, Tweede Serie, iii. Afdeeling, Meer uitgebreide Artikelen, No. 3 (Amsterdam, 1886), pp. 487 *sq.*; F. Warneck, "Das Eherecht bei den Toba-Batak," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, liii. (1901) pp. 540 *sq.*

[1] G. A. Wilken, "Over de verwantschap en het huwelijks- en erfrecht bij de volken van het maleische ras," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), i. 328 *sq.*

[2] J. C. van Eerde, "Een huwelijk bij de Minangkabausche Maleiers," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, xliv. (1901) p. 394.

[3] J. Winkler, "Bericht über die zweite Untersuchungsreise nach der Insel Engano," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, l. (1908) p. 152.

[4] M. C. Schadee, "Heirats- und andere Gebräuche bei den Mansela und Nusawele Alfuren in der Unterabteilung Wahasi der Insel Seram (Ceram)," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xxii. (1915) p. 135.

but apparently in most cases she did so. Only here again we must remember that the native term for brother (*tukoiab*) is used in the classificatory or group sense, so as to include certain first and second cousins. In these islands permission to marry a widow seems not to have been limited, as usually in India and sometimes in Africa, to the younger brothers of the deceased husband.[1] Among the Yabim of German New Guinea a man may marry his deceased wife's sister, but he is expected to earn her hand by first avenging the death of one of her kinsfolk.[2] Again, in the Louisiade Archipelago, to the east of New Guinea, when a woman dies, her husband may take her unmarried sister to wife without any fresh payment, and she may not refuse him. But if he does not care to marry her, and she marries somebody else, her husband must pay the bride-price to her dead sister's husband instead of to her own people. Yet though a man may, and indeed should, marry his deceased wife's sister, he ought not to approach her closely or hold prolonged conversation with her during his wife's lifetime, nor should he speak to her alone in the forest; if he does so, she might tell her sister, his wife, who would thereupon think she had cause for jealousy, and a domestic quarrel might be the result. In this case the ceremonial avoidance of the wife's sister in the lifetime of the wife is clearly a precaution to prevent an improper intimacy between the two. Further, in the Louisiade Archipelago the correlative custom of the levirate is also in vogue; that is, a man has a right to marry his deceased brother's widow, after she has completed her term of mourning.[3]

The sororate and levirate in the New Hebrides.

Similarly, in the New Hebrides, a widower marries his deceased wife's sister, and a widow marries her deceased husband's brother. "All these substitutions are explained

[1] Dr. W. H. R. Rivers in *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*, v. (Cambridge, 1904) pp. 244 *sq.* As to the native term *tukoiab*, which includes both brothers and sisters, see *id.*, pp. 130 *sqq.* As to the classificatory or group system of relationship, see above, pp. 227 *sqq.* The natives of the Eastern Islands of Torres Straits also observed the levirate. Among them a man's brothers had the right of marrying his widow, the eldest brother having the first claim. See *Reports of the Cambridge Expedition to Torres Straits*, vi. (Cambridge, 1908) pp. 124 *sq.*

[2] H. Zahn, "Die Jabim," in R. Neuhauss, *Deutsch Neu-Guinea* (Berlin, 1911), iii. 307.

[3] C. G. Seligmann, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea* (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 738 *sq.*

by the fact that the native pays for his wife. Since she is a slave, it is a gain for the brother who inherits her. In case this second marriage does not take place, the parents are obliged to restore the pigs paid by the first husband." [1] A like testimony to the strictly economic basis of the levirate in the New Hebrides and in Melanesia generally is borne by Dr. Codrington. "The levirate," he says, "obtains as a matter of course. The wife has been obtained for one member of a family by the contributions of the whole, and if that member fails by death, some other is ready to take his place, so that the property shall not be lost; it is a matter of arrangement for convenience and economy whether a brother, cousin, or uncle of the deceased shall take his widow. The brother naturally comes first; if a more distant relation takes the woman he probably has to give a pig. In Lepers' Island if a man who is a somewhat distant cousin of the deceased wishes to take the widow, he adds a pig to the death-feast of the tenth or fiftieth day to signify and support his pretensions, and he probably gives another pig to the widow's sisters to obtain their good-will. If two men contend for the widow she selects one, and the fortunate suitor gives a pig to the disappointed. In fact a woman, when once the proper payment has been made for her, belongs to those who have paid, the family generally." [2] In Futuna, one of the Southern New Hebrides, "a husband called each of his wife's sisters 'my wife.' They were all in the same relationship to him as his own wife, and if she died he took one of her unmarried sisters. The wife spoke of her husband's brothers as 'my husbands.'" [3] The significance of such terms for a wife's sister and a husband's brother will appear presently.

The sororate and levirate in Polynesia and Micronesia.

In Samoa polygamy was practised, and it often happened in former days that a bride was accompanied to her new home by her younger sister or sisters, who became secondary wives or concubines to the husband.[4] Or, at a later time, if

[1] A. Hagen et A. Pineau, "Les Nouvelles Hebrides," *Revue d'Ethnographie*, vii. (1889) pp. 330 *sq.*

[2] R. H. Codrington, D.D., *The Melanesians* (Oxford, 1891), p. 244.

[3] William Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna* (London, 1914), p. 206.

[4] George Brown, D.D., *Melanesians and Polynesians* (London, 1910), p. 123; Rev. S. Ella, "Samoa, etc.," *Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Hobart, Tasmania, in January 1892* (Sydney), p. 628.

a man was resolved on adding to his harem, "the principal wife often selected her own sister or sisters, and endeavoured to get them added to the family roll of wives, so that she might have some control over them. This plan was frequently adopted to avoid strangers being brought into the family."[1] Further, the Samoans observed the levirate as well as the sororate. "The brother of a deceased husband considered himself entitled to have his brother's wife, and to be regarded by the orphan children as their father. If he was already married, she would, nevertheless, live with him as a second wife. In the event of there being several brothers, they met and arranged which of them was to act the part of the deceased brother. The principal reason they alleged for the custom was a desire to prevent the woman and her children returning to her friends, and thereby diminishing the number and influence of their own family. And hence, failing a brother, some other relative would offer himself, and be received by the widow."[2] In Mangaia, one of the Hervey Islands, "in general, if a man of position married the eldest girl of a slave family, the younger sisters became his as a matter of course, being only too glad to have a protector. Even amongst those of equal rank a man often had two or three sisters to wife at the same time. Even now, in Christian times, a woman feels herself to be deeply injured if her brother-in-law does not, on the death of his wife, ask her to become a mother to his children."[3] In the Mortlock Islands custom assigned to a husband, along with his wife, all her free sisters, but only chiefs availed themselves of the privilege.[4] In Puynipet, one of the Caroline Islands, both the sororate and the levirate are in vogue; for a man marries his deceased wife's sister and his deceased brother's widow, even though, in the latter case, he is already married.[5]

[1] Rev. John B. Stair, *Old Samoa* (London, 1897), p. 175.

[2] George Turner, *Samoa a hundred years ago and long before* (London, 1884), p. 98.

[3] W. Wyatt Gill, "Mangaia (Hervey Islands)," *Report of the Second Meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Melbourne, Victoria, in January 1890* (Sydney), p. 331.

[4] J. Kubary, "Die Bewohner der Mortlock-Inseln," *Mittheilungen der geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg, 1878–79*, p. 37 (separate reprint).

[5] K. Scherzer, *Narrative of the Circumnavigation of the Globe by the Austrian Frigate "Novara"* (London, 1861–1863), ii. 581.

The sororate and levirate in Australia.

Some tribes of Queensland and North-West Australia allow a man to marry two or more sisters at once.[1] Thus in the Kariera tribe of North-Western Australia, "where there are several sisters in a family, they are all regarded as the wives of the man who marries the eldest of them. He may, if he chooses, waive his right in favour of his younger brother, with the consent of the father of the girls. If a family contained four girls, and a man took the two oldest, but permitted his younger brother to marry the third, the youngest daughter thereby also becomes the wife of the younger brother, and the older brother cannot claim any right to her. When a man dies, his wives pass to his younger brother or to the man who stands nearest to him in the relation of *margara*. This man marries the widow and adopts the children."[2] Thus the Kariera practise both the sororate and the levirate, and with them, as with many peoples, the levirate is restricted by the rule that it is only a younger brother who may inherit his deceased brother's widow. This transmission of a widow to a younger, but never to an elder, brother of the deceased husband is reported to be a very characteristic feature of the northern tribes of Central Australia,[3] and it is customary in the Kakadu tribe of Northern Australia.[4] Among the aborigines of South-West Victoria a man might marry his deceased wife's sister or his brother's widow; indeed, when a married man died leaving a family, it was the duty of his surviving brother to marry the widow and rear his deceased brother's children.[5] The custom of the levirate has been more commonly reported in Australia[6] than the custom of the sororate.

[1] The Bishop of Queensland (Dr. Frodsham), quoted in *Folk-lore*, xx. (1909) p. 352, and in *Man*, ix. (1909) p. 147; E. Clement, "Ethnographical Notes on the Western Australian Aborigines," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, xvi. (1904) p. 12.

[2] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 158. The term *margara* is applied to younger brothers in the classificatory or group sense, which includes the father's brother's son and the mother's sister's son, if he is younger than the speaker (*ib.* p. 149).

[3] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), p. 510.

[4] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia* (London, 1914), pp. 51 *sq.*

[5] James Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide, 1881), p. 27.

[6] For examples see A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), pp. 217, 220, 224, 227, 250, 257, 258, 266; R. Brough Smyth, *The Aborigines of Victoria*

The sororate and levirate seem to have originated in the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters.

The general conjunction of the sororate and the levirate in the usage of so many peoples renders it probable that, as I have already said, the two customs are correlative and admit of a similar explanation. "Taken together, the two customs seem to indicate the former prevalence of marriage between a group of husbands who were brothers to each other, and a group of wives who were sisters to each other. In practice the custom which permits a man to marry several sisters has diverged in an important respect from the custom which permits a woman to marry several brothers; for whereas the permission granted to a man to marry several sisters simultaneously in their lifetime has survived in many races to this day, the permission granted to a woman to marry several brothers has generally been restricted by the provision that she may only marry them successively, each after the death of his predecessor. We may conjecture that the cause of the divergence between the two customs was the greater strength of the passion of jealousy in men than in women, sisters being more willing to share a husband between them than brothers to share a wife."[1] The same cause may in large measure account for the great frequency of polygamy contrasted with the great rarity of polyandry in the human species.

Such a form of group marriage, in which all the husbands are brothers and all the wives are sisters, actually occurs in Australia, and among the Todas and Santals of India.

Thus the two customs of the sororate and the levirate seem traceable to a common source in a form of group marriage, in which all the husbands were brothers and all the wives were sisters. Nor are we left entirely to conjecture the former existence of such group marriages; instances of them

(Melbourne and London, 1878), i. 87; E. M. Curr, *The Australian Race* (Melbourne and London, 1886–1887), i. 107; F. Bonney, "On some Customs of the Aborigines of the River Darling, New South Wales," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii. (1884) p. 135; E. Palmer, "Notes on some Australian Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiii. (1884) p. 298; Carl Lumholtz, *Among Cannibals* (London, 1889), p. 164.

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 144. This explanation of the sororate and the levirate is not altogether novel; for L. H. Morgan explained the sororate by group marriage in which the wives were sisters, and A. W. Howitt explained the levirate by group marriage in which the husbands were brothers. See L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (London, 1877), p. 432; A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), p. 281. But it does not appear to have occurred to these eminent writers that the two hypotheses are complementary, and point to a form of group marriage in which all the wives were sisters and all the husbands were brothers.

have been noted by modern observers in several parts of the world. Among the tribes of North Queensland "a feature of more than ordinary interest is the right of marital relationship between a husband and his wife's blood sisters on the Pennefather and Tully Rivers, and between a wife and her husband's blood brothers on the Tully River. Cases of this nature, coupled with the handing over of the widow to her late husband's brother, bear strong evidence of communal marriage in a very primitive condition, before the distinction had come to be made between the blood- and group-members of the different class-systems." [1] Thus, on the Tully River a group of men, who are blood brothers, have marital relations with a group of women who are blood sisters. This is exactly the form of group marriage in which, on my hypothesis, both the sororate and the levirate took their rise. Again, among the Todas of Southern India, "if there be four or five brothers, and one of them, being old enough, gets married, his wife claims all the other brothers as her husbands, and as they successively attain manhood, she consorts with them; or if the wife has one or more younger sisters, they in turn, on attaining a marriageable age, become the wives of their sister's husband or husbands, and thus in a family of several brothers there may be, according to circumstances, only one wife for them all, or many; but, one or more, they all live under one roof, and cohabit promiscuously, just as fancy or taste inclines." [2] Again, the Santals, a primitive tribe of Bengal, "not only allow a husband's younger brothers to share his wife's favours, but permit the husband in his turn to have access to his wife's younger sisters. This latter custom is an approach to the Hawaiian group marriages of brothers and sisters, which formed the foundation for Morgan's theory of a Punaluan family. To a modified extent it has its counterpart in Ladakh, where the wife of several brothers can bring in her sister as a co-wife." [3] "A Santal's wife is common property with him and all his younger brothers as

[1] Walter E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10, Marriage Ceremonies and Infant Life* (1908), p. 3.

[2] J. Shortt, M.D., "An Account of the Hill Tribes of the Neilgherries," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, New Series, vii. (London, 1869), p. 240.

[3] *Census of India, 1911*, vol. i. *India*, Part i. *Report*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait (Calcutta, 1913), p. 240.

regards conjugal relations, even after the younger brothers marry for themselves. Similarly, a Santal woman's younger sisters legitimately share without marriage all her conjugal privileges with her husband. The above relations were quite common thirty-five years ago, and are still in vogue, though they are, perhaps, not quite so openly indulged in now." [1]

The Santal custom of marriage between a group of brothers and a group of sisters.

The Santal custom which thus permits conjugal relations between a group of brothers and a group of sisters has been described more fully by Mr. C. H. Craven, Assistant Settlement Officer at Dumka, and his description deserves to be quoted in full, since it illustrates not only the general working of this form of group marriage, but also those special features of the sororate and the levirate which depend on a distinction of age between elder brothers and younger brothers, between elder sisters and younger sisters. Mr. Craven's account runs as follows :—

"*Traces of fraternal Polyandry amongst the Santāls.*—Among the Santāls, the wife of a younger brother is treated most deferentially by the elder brother. To quote a familiar saying, 'the *bokot bahu* (younger brother's wife) is like a *bonga* (god).' From the day of her marriage, when the *bokot bahu* catches the elder brother round the ankles and demands a present (a ceremony known as *katkom*),[2] the *bokot bahu* and the elder brother must never so much as touch one another. The relations between them become very strict; they cannot enter into the same room or remain together in the courtyard unless others are present. Should the *bokot bahu* come in from work in the fields and find the elder brother sitting alone in the *raca*, or courtyard, she must remain in the village street or in the outer verandah of the house till some other people enter the house.

"The *bokot bahu* cannot usually sit down in the presence of the *dadat* (elder brother), and it is absolutely improper for her to take a seat on a *parkom*, or bed, while he is close at hand. Should it be necessary for the *bokot bahu* to sit down while the elder brother is close by, she must use a *gando*, or low stool. She can never loosen or comb her hair before

[1] Rev. L. O. Skreefsrud (Sonthal Parganas), in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, lxxii. Part iii. No. 2, 1903, p. 90.

[2] "The literal meaning of *katkom* is 'crab,' which is supposed to indicate the firmness of the girl's grip."

the elder brother. To do so would be considered highly improper, and would imply that the relations between them had become much too familiar.

"The intercourse, on the other hand, between the elder brother's wife (*hili*) and the unmarried younger brothers is remarkably free and easy. They can flirt and jest together quite openly, and until the younger brothers find suitable helpmates of their own it is not improper for them to share their elder brother's wife, so long as they respect his dignity and feelings and do not indulge in amorous dalliance in his presence. Subject to this condition the elder brother and the village community do not consider that the matter specially concerns them. Santāl women often complain that their husband's younger brothers are carrying on intrigues with other girls when they can get all they want at home.

"When an elder brother dies, his widow very frequently takes up her abode with one of the younger brothers as a kind of elder wife, and this almost invariably happens in cases where the widow has been left badly off. This relic of polyandry is not confined to the Santāls or to tribes low down in the social scale. It is common to Goalas, Kalwars, and to some septs of Rajputs.

"The relations between husbands and their wives' younger sisters (*erwel kuriko*) are perhaps even less restricted, and it is considered quite legitimate for a man to carry on an intrigue with his wife's younger sister, provided the damsel is agreeable, the only stipulation being that if she became *enceinte* her brother-in-law (*tenay*) must take her to wife permanently. Santāl wives are usually frantically jealous, but they seldom fail to tolerate, and have been known to encourage, improper relations between their consorts and their younger sisters. It is often urged as an excuse for the practice that the latter are thus kept from going wrong with other young men.

"The improper relations usually cease when the younger brothers and younger sisters get married. They are moreover limited very considerably by the natural temperament of the members of a family. All elder brothers do not submit tamely to their wives being enjoyed in common; all wives are not complacent, nor do all younger brothers and

younger sisters conform to what is asked of them. Families often become divided in consequence of an indulgence in these practices, but the fact that they are recognized and form a part of the social system of the Santāl is incontestable."[1]

The Santal form of group marriage combines the sororate and the levirate.

Thus among the Santals a group of brothers is permitted to exercise marital rights over a group of sisters; and when one of the brothers dies, his widow very often, in some cases invariably, is taken as an elder wife by his younger brother. Hence the Santals practise both the sororate and the levirate, and among them these customs are the outcome of what is, to all intents and purposes, a form of group marriage contracted between a group of brothers on the one hand and a group of sisters on the other. Yet this union is by no means absolutely loose and indiscriminate; it is subject to certain definite rules which concern in particular the respective ages of the persons who compose the groups. A man who has married a wife obtains thereby a right of access to her younger unmarried sisters, but apparently not to her elder sisters; and if we ask, Why not to her elder sisters? the answer would probably be that, in accordance with the common rule which prescribes that an elder sister must marry before a younger, the elder sisters are already married and therefore appropriated to other men. For a like reason, when a wife's younger sisters marry, the man who married their elder sister usually ceases to exercise marital rights over them, because by their marriage they are appropriated to other men. Again, a younger unmarried brother exercises marital rights over his elder brother's wife; but as soon as he marries a wife of his own, he usually ceases to have access to his elder brother's wife,[2] and his elder brother is from the first strictly debarred not only from conjugal but even from ordinary social relations with his younger brother's wife. The stringent rules of mutual avoidance which are incumbent on an elder brother and his younger brother's wife are clearly nothing but precautions to prevent improper relations between the two; and the same explana-

[1] C. H. Craven, Assistant Settlement Officer, Dumka, in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. lxxii. Part iii. No. 2, 1903, pp. 88-90.

[2] So Mr. Craven reports (above, p. 307); but Mr. Skreefsrud's account is different (above, pp. 305 *sq.*).

tion, as I have already pointed out,[1] probably applies to every similar case of ceremonial avoidance practised between persons of opposite sexes in rude society.

In such a system the communal groups are constantly changing, being perpetually decomposed and recomposed.

We see then that among the Santals the communal groups consist of an elder married brother and a number of unmarried younger brothers on the one hand, and an elder married sister and a number of unmarried younger sisters on the other hand. When one of the younger brothers or younger sisters marries, he or she normally falls out of the group; when all the younger brothers and sisters have married, the old communal groups are dissolved and either replaced by single couples or, more probably, recomposed into fresh communal groups by the new marital relations which on his marriage each younger brother contracts with his wife's younger sisters, and which on her marriage each younger sister contracts with her husband's younger brothers. On this showing, the social system of the Santals consists of a series of communal groups which are constantly being dissolved and recomposed in fresh forms, the dissolution being effected by the desire of each man to appropriate a wife to himself, and the recomposition being effected by his desire to enlarge the circle of his women. Thus the centripetal force of sexual communism, which tends to collect the whole of society into a single aggregate, is perpetually counteracted by the centrifugal force which tends to break up that aggregate into a series of isolated couples; the same antagonism which we see at work in the macrocosm of the physical world is at work in the microcosm of the social world, producing a perpetually shifting kaleidoscope of molecules now meeting, now parting, now integrating, now disintegrating, always in motion, never at rest.

Parallel between the Santal system of group marriage and the Thonga system, in which one feature has disappeared.

The Santal system of group marriage, in accordance with which a group of brothers cohabits with a group of sisters, subject only to certain restrictions in regard to age, may be compared with the Thonga system,[2] which exactly resembles it except that among the Thonga the brothers no longer share each other's wives in their lifetime, but only succeed to them, one after the other, as each brother dies; to put it otherwise, in the Thonga system fraternal com-

[1] Above, pp. 160 *sq.*

[2] Above, pp. 276 *sq.*

munism in wives has been replaced by the levirate, but the sororate in its original form remains intact, since a man has the right of marrying his wife's younger sisters either in her lifetime or after her death. Thus the full communal marriage of a group of brothers with a group of sisters, which survives among the Santals, has been reduced among the Thonga by the disappearance of all the male partners but one, while the female partners still muster in undiminished number. The equipoise between the sexes has been disturbed to the advantage of the male, who now enjoys all the females, and to the corresponding disadvantage of the female, who is now reduced to the enjoyment, so to say, of only a fraction of a single male. The change is probably due in great measure to the superior strength and fiercer jealousy of the male, who in time refuses to share his females with a rival. But in the broken-down Thonga system both sexes continue to observe the very same restrictions in regard to age which are observed in the still full-blown Santal system of communal marriage. For while the husband may make free with his wife's younger sisters, because they can become his wives, he is forbidden to take liberties with her elder sisters, because they cannot become his wives; and on the other hand he carefully avoids the wives of his younger brothers, because under ordinary circumstances he cannot inherit them, whereas he is free to dally with the wives of his elder brother, because he will inherit them after his brother's death. So exact a correspondence between the Thonga and the Santal systems points to a common basis in custom, and that basis is found in a conjugal group composed of husbands who are brothers and of wives who are sisters. Such a conjugal group exists practically intact among the Santals; it survives in a mutilated, one-sided form among the Thonga. Another imperfect survival of such a conjugal group is found among the Bhuiyas, a large and important aboriginal tribe of Bengal, Orissa, and the Central Provinces. With them "a widow is often taken by the younger brother of the deceased husband, though no compulsion is exerted over her. But the match is common because the Bhuiyas have the survival of fraternal polyandry, which consists in allowing unmarried younger brothers to have access to an

Common basis of Thonga and Santal systems in group marriage.

Survival of group marriage among the Bhuiyas of India.

elder brother's wife during his lifetime."[1] Thus among the Bhuiyas the levirate appears to be a relic of polyandry, that is, of the one-sided form of group marriage in which a single wife is shared by a group of brothers. This is clearly just the converse of the Thonga system, in which a single husband is shared by a group of sisters. The two systems, the Thonga and the Bhuiya, are complementary, and together represent that full or symmetrical system of group marriage in which a group of brothers is married to a group of sisters.

The theory that the sororate and levirate originated in the marriage of a group of brothers with a group of sisters is confirmed by an examination of certain classificatory terms of relationship.

The theory which deduces both the sororate and the levirate from a common source in the marriage of a group of brothers with a group of sisters may be confirmed by an examination of the terms for husband and wife which are employed in the classificatory or group system of relationship. If the classificatory or group system of relationship accurately reflects, as I have argued, a system of group marriage, it ought to contain a record of that particular form of group marriage, which consists in the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters, on the supposition that such a marriage was a widespread and characteristic feature in the relations of the sexes at a certain stage of social evolution. Should the classificatory or group system of relationship be found on examination to contain terms which appear to be only explicable on the hypothesis of such marriages of groups of brothers to groups of sisters, the discovery will furnish a strong argument in favour of the view that this particular form of group marriage has prevailed widely, and consequently that it may be the source both of the sororate and of the levirate, which appear to be its detached halves produced by fission of the original group. On the other hand, should the classificatory or group system of relationship be found to contain no terms corresponding to such a form of group marriage, the absence of the corresponding terms would raise a presumption of the absence of the institution.

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), ii. 317. As usual, a Bhuiya widow is only allowed to marry her deceased husband's younger brother; she is strictly forbidden to marry his elder brother. See (Sir) H. H. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1892), i. 114.

If the theory is right, there should be one and the same term for wife, wife's sister, and brother's wife; and there should be one and the same term for husband, husband's brother, and sister's husband.

What then are the classificatory or group terms of relationship which would correspond to and express the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters? First, let us look at this supposed marriage from the point of view of the man. In such a marriage he exercises marital rights equally over a group of sisters; therefore he calls all the sisters his wives. Again, he exercises marital rights equally over all his brothers' wives; therefore he calls all his brothers' wives his wives. Hence he applies the term wife to the whole group of sisters and to the whole group of his brothers' wives, since these two groups of women are in fact one and the same. Second, let us look at this supposed marriage from the point of view of the woman. In such a marriage she enjoys conjugal rights equally over a group of brothers; therefore she calls all the brothers her husbands. Again, she enjoys conjugal rights equally over all her sisters' husbands; therefore she calls all her sisters' husbands her husbands. Hence she applies the term husband to the whole group of brothers and to the whole group of her sisters' husbands, since these two groups of men are in fact one and the same. To sum up, on the hypothesis of a form of group marriage in which all the husbands are brothers and all the wives are sisters, we should expect to find the following equations:—

wife = wife's sister = brother's wife (*man speaking*)
husband = husband's brother = sister's husband (*woman speaking*).

Now this identity of terms, pointing to the marriage of a group of brothers with a group of sisters, is found in various forms of the classificatory or group system of relationship.

Now if we examine the actual systems of classificatory or group relationship we shall find that a number of them contain terms for husband and wife which conform exactly to these equations, the term for wife including the wife's sister and the brother's wife, and the term for husband including the husband's brother and the sister's husband. Systems of relationship containing these equations are particularly common in Australia, where the forms of marriage approximate more closely than elsewhere to that system of group marriage on which the classificatory or group system of relationship is founded. Hence the frequency with which in aboriginal Australia the term for wife coincides with the

terms for wife's sister and brother's wife, and the term for husband coincides with the terms for husband's brother and sister's husband, raises a strong presumption in favour of the view that these communal terms originally corresponded to and expressed the communal marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters.

Identity of terms for (*a*) wife, wife's sister, brother's wife, and (*b*) husband, husband's brother, and sister's husband, in many Australian tribes.

Thus to take instances, in the Kurnai tribe of south-eastern Victoria a man applies the same term (*maian*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*bra*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[1] In the Yuin tribe of south-eastern New South Wales a man applies the same term (*nadjanduri*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*tarrama*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[2] In the Wotjobaluk tribe of Victoria a man applies the same term (*matjun*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a wife applies the same term (*nanitch*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[3] In the Wurunjeri tribe of Victoria a man applies the same term (*bimbang*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*nangurung*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[4] In the Watu-Watu or Wathi-Wathi tribe of Victoria a man applies the same term (*nopui*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*nopui*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[5] In the Northern Kamilaroi tribe of New South Wales a man applies the same term (*ungina*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*golid*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[6] In the Kaiabara tribe of south-eastern Queensland a man applies

[1] A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group-relationships," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907) p. 287.

[2] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*

[3] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*

[4] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*

[5] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.* Here Dr. Howitt calls the tribe Watu-Watu. Elsewhere he calls it, Wathi-Wathi (*Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 50, etc.).

[6] A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group-relationships," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907) p. 287.

the same term (*malemungan*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*malaume*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[1] In the Kuinmurbura tribe of eastern Queensland a man applies the same term (*gingil*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*nupa*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[2] In the Kurnandaburi tribe of southern Queensland a man applies the same term (*abaija*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*abaija*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[3] In the Dieri tribe of Central Australia a man applies the same term (*noa*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*noa*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[4] In the Urabunna tribe of Central Australia a man applies the same term (*nupa*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*nupa*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[5] In the Arunta tribe of Central Australia a man applies the same term (*unawa*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*unawa*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[6] In the Warramunga tribe of Central Australia a man applies the same term (*katununga*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*kulla-kulla*) to her husband and to her husband's brother.[7] In the Binbinga tribe of Northern Australia a man applies the same term (*karina*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*kaikai*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[8] In the Port

[1] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[2] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[3] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[4] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[5] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[6] A. W. Howitt, *l.c.*
[7] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), p. 79. The writers do not say, but we may conjecture, that a woman applies the same term (*kulla-kulla*) to her sister's husband.
[8] A. W. Howitt, "Australian Group-relationships," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907) p. 287.

Essington tribe of Northern Australia a man applies the same term (*angban* or *ilkuma*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*ilkuma*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[1] In the Melville Island tribe of Northern Australia a man applies the same term (*yamoaniya*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*yabmuneinga*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[2] In the Kariera tribe of North-Western Australia a man applies the same term (*ñuba*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*ñuba*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[3] In the Mardudhunera tribe of North-Western Australia a man applies the same term (*yagan*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*yagan*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[4]

Thus the use of communal terms for husband and wife extends across the whole length and breadth of Australia, from south-east to north-west. The terms themselves vary almost from tribe to tribe, yet their application is identical, pointing clearly to an identical system, whether present or past, of communal or group marriage. That system appears to be based on the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters, since the terms expressive of conjugal relations are exactly such as would necessarily arise from the existence of such marriages.

The identity of terms points to a system of group marriage.

A similar use of communal terms for husband and wife occurs among other peoples who possess the classificatory or group system of relationship. Thus in the Melanesian

Identity of terms for (*a*) wife, wife's sister, and brother's wife, and (*b*) husband, husband's brother, and sister's husband in some parts of Melanesia and Polynesia.

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia* (London, 1914), pp. 70, 71. "*Angban* is the general term for mother's brother's daughters, all of whom are eligible as wives to a man except the daughters of his mother's actual blood brothers. *Ilkuma* is the name applied to the actual woman or women a man marries. Before marriage he calls them *angban*" (*ib.* p. 70 note [1])

[2] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia*, pp. 71, 73.

[3] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 149.

[4] A. R. Brown, "Three Tribes of Western Australia," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) p. 178.

island of Vanua Lava, one of the Banks' Islands, a man applies the same term (*rengoma*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*amanma*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[1] Again, a like use of communal terms for husband and wife is found in Polynesia. Thus in Hawaii a man applies the same term (*wa-hee-na*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*ka-na*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[2] Again, in Tonga a man applies the same term (*hoku unoho*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*hoku unoho*) to her husband, to her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[3] And in general, with very few exceptions, the Polynesian forms of the classificatory or group system of relationship "agree in the feature that a man and his wife's sister or his brother's wife address and speak of one another as if they were man and wife."[4] Indeed, in some parts of Polynesia "marital relations between those who call one another husband and wife have been permitted till comparatively recent times."[5] Thus among the Polynesians group marriage survived in fact as well as in name not so long ago. This coincidence of terms indicative of group marriage with the existence of the institution itself strongly confirms the conclusion that the use of communal terms to denote conjugal relations is everywhere based ultimately on a system of communal or group marriage.

Similar communal terms for husband and wife among the Gilyaks.

Lastly, among the Gilyaks of the Amoor River, who have the classificatory or group system of relationship, we find precisely the same use of communal terms for husband and wife. A man applies the same term (*àngej*) to his wife, to his wife's sister, and to his brother's wife; and a woman applies the same term (*pu*) to her husband, to

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society* (Cambridge, 1915), i. 31.

[2] Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (London, 1877), pp. 422 *sq.*

[3] Lewis H. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington City, 1871), p. 576.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 33.

[5] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 34.

her husband's brother, and to her sister's husband.[1] Here again, therefore, we may infer the existence, present or past, of a system of communal marriage based on the union of a group of brothers with a group of sisters.

This form of group marriage may have originated in an exchange of sisters.

If we ask what was the origin of a form of group marriage which would seem to have prevailed so widely, we may conjecture that it rested on a system of exchange like that which appears to lie at the root of the cross-cousin marriage. We have seen that as a matter of fact men commonly exchange their sisters in marriage, because that is the easiest and cheapest way of obtaining a wife. For similar reasons in a society where group marriage was in vogue, it would be natural for a group of brothers to exchange their sisters for the sisters of another group of brothers, each set of men thereafter using the sisters of the other set of men as their common wives. In this way, on the simple principle of bartering women between families, a system of group marriage might easily arise in which all the husbands of each group were brothers and all the wives of each group were sisters to each other, though not to their husbands.

The sororate and levirate derived from group marriage.

Thus, if I am right, the sororate and the levirate are offshoots from one common root, a system of group marriage in which all the husbands were brothers and all the wives were sisters to each other, though not to their husbands; and that system in its turn originated in a simple desire to get wives as easily and cheaply as possible.

The sororate and levirate limited in regard to seniority and juniority.

But there still remain features in the sororate and the levirate of which no complete explanation has yet been suggested. Why may a man marry his wife's younger but not her elder sister? Why may a man marry the widow of his elder but not of his younger brother? Or to put the same questions from the other side, why may a woman marry the husband of her elder but not of her younger sister? Why may a widow marry her late husband's younger but not his elder brother? Such definite rules

[1] Leo Sternberg, "The Turano-Ganowánian System and the Nations of North-East Asia," *Proceedings of the XVIII. International Congress of Americanists*, p. 323.

must have had definite causes, and it is worth while to try to discover them.

Other limitations of marriage in regard to seniority and juniority.

These are not the only distinctions dependent on age which have met us in the present inquiry. We have seen that in some parts of India a man is allowed and even encouraged to marry his niece, the daughter of his elder sister, but that he is strictly forbidden to marry his other niece, the daughter of his younger sister.[1] Further, we have seen that among the Urabunna of Central Australia a man is allowed and even encouraged to marry his cross-cousins, the daughters of his mother's elder brother or of his father's elder sister, but that he is strictly forbidden to marry his other cross-cousins, the daughters of his mother's younger brother or of his father's younger sister.[2] We may surmise that all these rules permitting or prohibiting marriage according to seniority or juniority are referable to one common principle. What was that principle?

Rule that a younger brother or sister may not marry before his or her senior.

A starting-point in the inquiry is perhaps furnished by the rule that a younger brother or sister may not marry before his elder brother or sister. That rule appears to be both widespread and ancient; and the penalty of damnation, with which Indian lawgivers threatened all breaches of the statute, seems to show that in their minds the practice rested on a foundation much deeper than mere propriety.

Division of savage communities into age-grades.

Perhaps the custom of not allowing a younger brother or sister to marry before an elder may go back to a system of age-grades such as still exists in some savage tribes, notably in a group of East African tribes of which the Masai may be regarded as typical. Under such a system the whole community is divided into a series of groups according to age, and the transition from one group to another is commonly marked by certain ceremonies, which at the transition from youth to adult years often take the form of severe and painful ordeals undergone by the young people of both sexes before they are admitted to the full rights of manhood and womanhood, above all to the right of marriage.[3]

Age-grades among the Kaya-Kaya or Tugeri of Dutch New Guinea.

For example, among the Kaya-Kaya or Tugeri, a large

[1] Above, pp. 109, 113 *sqq.*

[2] Above, p. 187.

[3] On these age-grades in general, see H. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde* (Berlin, 1902), pp. 125 *sqq.*; Hutton Webster, *Primitive Secret Societies* (New York, 1908), pp. 83 *sqq.*

and notorious tribe of head-hunters in the south-east corner of Dutch New Guinea, there are seven such classes or age-grades for the males and six for the females. Each class or age-grade has its distinctive badges and mode of wearing the hair. Amongst the males the first age-grade (*patur*) comprises all boys up to puberty. These live with their parents in the village and are free to go anywhere. But as soon as signs of puberty appear on their persons, they pass into the second age-grade (*aroi-patur*) and are banished from the village, which they are forbidden to enter unless they fall ill. In that case they are carried to their father's house in the village, but must shun the presence of women and girls. Otherwise they live with the young men in the bachelors' hall or men's house (*gotad*), which is built by itself behind the village in the forest or under the shadow of coco-nut palms. There may be more than one such bachelors' hall. Women may never enter one of these buildings when there are people in it, but the men often gather there. When the lad is fully developed he passes into the third age-grade (*wokravid* or *bokravid*). He may still not enter the village, and the presence of women and girls is absolutely forbidden to him. If he sees one of them afar off on the path, he must hide himself or go round about to avoid her. The fourth age-grade (*ewati*), which may last three or four years, is the hey-day of life for a Kaya-Kaya man. In the prime of youthful vigour, he struts about with dandified airs, admired by the world in general and ogled by the girls in particular. He must still avoid women, but when he knows they are passing the bachelors' hall, which he graces with his presence, he will make a loud noise to attract their attention, and they will say admiringly in his hearing, "That's he! What a young buck it is!" Now, too, is the time for him to choose a wife, if a girl has not been already reserved for him. He makes presents to the damsel of his choice, and if she accepts them, the two are regarded as betrothed. The young man thus enters the fifth age-grade (*miakim*), which is that of the betrothed men. He is now free to return to the village and to live there, and he ceases to avoid women, though good manners require him to appear somewhat shy and bashful in their presence. When he

The age-grades of Kaya-Kaya men.

marries he passes into the sixth age-grade (*amnangib*), which is that of the married men. He is now master of himself and of his wife; he is accountable to no man for his actions, for there are no chiefs and no judges. He lives a free man among his peers. When he grows old he passes into the seventh and last age-grade (*mes-miakim*), which is that of the old men. He now receives a title (*somb-anem*), which may be translated "signior" or "great man," and his opinion carries weight in council. Every man, if he lives to old age, must pass through all of these age-grades; he may not omit any of them. The transition from one age-grade to another is always an occasion of feasting and dancing.

The age-grades of Kaya-Kaya women.

The six age-grades of the Kaya-Kaya women correspond to the seven of the men, except that there is none among them which answers to the second age-grade of the men. In the first age-grade (*kivazum*), which lasts to the age of ten or eleven, a girl plays freely with the boys in their less noisy games; she follows her mother and the other women to the plantations or to the seashore to gather shells. She is at liberty to roam the village, but may not enter the young men's house (*gotad*). Arrived at the second age-grade (*wahuku*), she begins to wear a scanty covering and to assume a certain reserve; in particular she ceases to associate with the boys. She now helps her mother in the plantation, learns to pound sago, and to carry burdens. The third age-grade (*kivazum-iwag*) answers to the fourth of the men. It is for a girl the time of the roses—if roses could bloom under the tropical sun of New Guinea—the time when she blossoms out in the pride of youthful beauty, the admired of all admirers, the cynosure of neighbouring eyes. In the fourth age-grade (*iwag*) she is generally betrothed, and may either stay in the village or work in the plantations with the other women. But she is spared the heavy burdens and the hard toil; for care is taken to preserve the fresh bloom and grace of her youth till marriage. Hence the girls are for the most part plump and buxom. Strangers may not tamper with them in presence of the men. The head of more than one Chinaman and Malay, who has made too free with a Kaya-Kaya maiden, now adorns the collection of skulls in a Kaya-Kaya village. The fifth age-grade (*saf*) is that of the married

women. A wife is the slave of her husband. It is she who bends under the heavy load, while he saunters jauntily behind her with his bow and arrows and perhaps a basket. However, he relieves her of the hardest field labour, hoeing the ground himself while she weeds it; and husband and wife may be seen side by side mending the ditches and cutting sago-palms and banana-trees. It is the wife's business to pound the sago and bake it into cakes; and she cooks the venison. The sixth age-grade (*mes-iwag*) is that of the old women. If she is hale and hearty, an old woman will still go out to the plantations to help her husband or her gossips; while the feeble old crones potter about in the village, weaving mats, mending nets, or making cradles to rock their infant grandchildren.[1] It is perhaps not irrelevant to add that the Kaya-Kaya are divided into totemic and exogamous clans with descent in the paternal line; in other words, no man may marry a woman of his own totemic clan, and children take their totem from their father.[2]

Age-grades among the natives about Bartle Bay in British New Guinea.

Again, the natives about Bartle Bay, in the extreme south-east of British New Guinea, are divided into age-grades. All the individuals of the same sex, who are approximately of the same age, having been born within about two years of each other, are considered to belong to the same class (called a *kimta*). Members of the same class or age-grade are entitled to each other's fellowship and help. The men hunt together and work together at the irrigation dams and ditches; the women fish together in the river. A child would call all the male members of his father's age-grade his fathers; and he would call all the women of his mother's age-grade his mothers. The members of an age-grade are not all congregated in the same village, but dispersed among villages to a distance of twenty or thirty miles or more. From all of them a man may expect to receive hospitality and assistance, but between him and the members of his own age-grade in his own village the social bond is

[1] H. Nollen, "Les différentes Classes d'Age dans la Société kaia-kaia, Merauke, Nouvelle Guinée Néerlandaise," *Anthropos*, iv. (1909) pp. 553-573.

[2] R. Pöch, "Vierter Bericht über meine Reise nach Neu-Guinea," *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), cxv. (1906), Abteilung i. p. 900; *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. 285 *sq.*

particularly close. Such mates are called *eriam* to each other. They keep together in war, borrow each other's fishing-nets, take food, in case of need, from each other's gardens, and freely exercise marital rights over each other's wives, except so far as these women are barred to them by the laws of consanguinity or totemic exogamy; for the people are divided into totemic and exogamous clans with descent of the totem in the female line. Naturally enough, therefore, a child applies the name of father to all the men of his or her father's age-grade who reside in the village; and logically, though perhaps less naturally, he or she applies the name of mother to all the wives of these men. But the children of members of the same age-grade, residing in the same village, may not marry nor have sexual relations with each other. The right of access which a man has to the wives of his mates (*meriam*) is, moreover, subject to a limitation. If he has only one wife, and his mate has several, he has only rights over one of these women; the principle of group marriage is thus regulated by the principle of an equitable exchange; it would clearly be unjust for a man who can only lend one woman to expect to borrow several in return.[1] Further it deserves to be noticed that among these people in former times there seem to have been clubhouses for men of different ages; one for old men, one for men rather past middle age, one for men in the prime of life, and one for young unmarried men.[2] But obviously these distinctions of age do not coincide with the age-grades, if the age-grades are separated from each other by short intervals of two years.

Age-grades among the tribes of British East Africa.

The system of age-grades is found well developed in a large group of tribes in British East Africa, which appear for the most part to belong to the Nilotic and not to the Bantu

[1] C. G. Seligmann, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea* (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 470-476. As to the totemism of these people, see *id.* pp. 446 *sqq.*

[2] C. G. Seligmann, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 495. In the Ami tribe of Formosa there is a system of ten or twelve age-grades for males. A boy joins the lowest grade when he reaches his fourteenth or fifteenth year, and he is promoted to a higher grade every five or eight years. The elder men, belonging to the higher age-grade, exercise control over social matters. See Shinji Ishii, *The Island of Formosa and its Primitive Inhabitants*, p. 13 (reprinted from *The Transactions of the Japan Society of London*, vol. xiv.).

stock. Thus among the Masai all males belong to an age-grade (*poror* or *boror*), which includes all men who have been circumcised within a period of seven and a half years. When leave has been granted by the medicine-man to hold the circumcision festivals, one such feast is held in every sub-district every year for four years in succession, and all males who have been circumcised at any one of these four successive feasts are members of the same age-grade. Then follows an interval of about three and a half years during which no circumcision feast is held. Hence the period of time covered by an age-grade is about seven and a half years. Two successive age-grades are known as "the right-hand circumcision" and "the left-hand circumcision" respectively; together they constitute a generation, which is thus a period of about fifteen years. Each of the two age-grades, "the right-hand circumcision" and "the left-hand circumcision," has to observe certain rules which forbid the pronunciation of certain words and the eating of certain foods. Thus men of "the right-hand circumcision" may eat neither the heads nor the tails of slaughtered cattle, and they must use special words for heads and tails, and also for a goat's fold. Men of "the left-hand circumcision" may not eat pumpkins and cucumbers, and they may not call arrow-poison by its ordinary name. To do or say any of these things in the presence of a man who is forbidden by custom to say or do it, is an insult which often provokes retaliation on the spot. As a rule, boys are circumcised when they are between thirteen and seventeen years old. Orphans and the children of poor parents often wait until they are twenty. Women do not, strictly speaking, belong to an age-grade, because they are not circumcised, like the men, in groups at regular intervals; the operation is performed on them at odd times as they grow up and before they marry. However, they are reckoned to the age-grade which happens to coincide with the time at which they are circumcised.[1]

Age-grades among the Masai.

Between men and women of the same age-grade among the Masai sexual communism or group marriage appears to

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai* (Oxford, 1905), pp. 261-263; M. Merker, *Die Masai* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 70 *sq.*; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of a A-Kamba and other East African Tribes* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 122. As to the circumcision of girls, see A. C. Hollis, *The Masai*, p. 299.

Sexual communism or group marriage between members of the same age-grade among the Masai.

prevail, subject only to the restrictions that a man may not marry or cohabit with a woman of his own sub-clan, nor with a woman who is more nearly related to him by blood than third cousin. But while with these exceptions he has free access to the women of his own age-grade, he is debarred from sexual relations with women of the age-grades corresponding to those of his son and his father; to cohabit with a woman of either of these age-grades is a serious offence, which renders the offender liable to severe punishment. On this important point it may be well to quote the evidence of Mr. A. C. Hollis, our principal authority on the Masai. He says:—

A.C. Hollis on sexual communism among the Masai.

"Though individual marriage is recognised, sexual communism or something very like it prevails between all the men of one age-grade and the women of the corresponding age-grade, subject to the rules of exogamy and relationship, which forbid a man to marry or have sexual intercourse with a woman of his own clan or with a near relative. In other words the Masai may be said to live in a state of group marriage, based on the organisation of the whole community in age-grades, and restricted by the exogamy of the sub-clans and the rules regarding incest. If a man is knowingly guilty of incest, or has sexual intercourse with a daughter of his own sub-clan, he is punished by his relations, who flog him and slaughter some of his cattle. If he fornicates or commits adultery with a daughter of a member of his own age-grade, he is punished by the members of his age-grade. His kraal is destroyed, he is severely beaten, and a number of his oxen are slaughtered. If a warrior or boy commits adultery with a wife of a man belonging to his father's age-grade, he is solemnly cursed by the members of that age-grade. Unless he pays the elders two oxen, one for them to eat and the other to enable them to buy honey wine, and prays them to remove the curse, it is supposed he will die."[1]

To a certain extent the system of age-grades exists

[1] A. C. Hollis, "A Note on the Masai System of Relationship and other matters connected therewith," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 480. Compare C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 122, "A man cannot marry the daughter of a man of his own age—he must marry the

among the Wataveta, a tribe of British East Africa, whose territory borders on that of the Masai. They are a mixed race of Hamitic and Bantu stock, who inhabit the rich and fertile district of Taveta at the foot of the mighty snow-capped Kilimanjaro, the highest mountain in Africa. With them an age-grade (*irika*) comprises a period of fifteen years, and every age-grade has a special name. Thus the age-grade of the Wataveta is equal to two age-grades or one generation of the Masai. The government of the country is entrusted for one such period of about fifteen years to the men of one of these age-grades, at whose head are four middle-aged chiefs. It is said that the members of a particular age-grade come into power whenever they can kidnap the daughter of one of the ruling chiefs or one of his contemporaries. In this they are aided and abetted by the elders of the former age-grade, who were themselves turned out of office in the same manner by their juniors some fifteen years before, and are now glad to serve their supplanters as their supplanters once served them. In olden times the reigning chiefs and their fellows never succumbed without a battle royal, and it was not without difficulty that the younger men snatched the reins of power from the hands of their elders. Formerly it was a matter of no small consequence to belong to the reigning age-grade, for two-thirds of the spoils of war and of the duty levied on all caravans passing through the country were appropriated by the chiefs and their contemporaries, while the rest went to the witch-doctors and the other old men.[1]

Age-grades among the Wataveta of British East Africa.

The Wataveta, like the Masai, are divided into clans

daughter of a man of a previous age to his own," where by "age" the writer means age-grade (*poror*). Though in the passage quoted above Mr. A. C. Hollis speaks in one place of the clans as if they were exogamous, he tells us expressly (p. 479 note [1]) that the *clans* are not exogamous, but that the *sub-clans* into which the clans are divided are exogamous; and he adds that "no man may marry a nearer relation than a third cousin."

The Wakuafi, a tribe akin to the Masai, and inhabiting the same region of East Africa, also possess a system of age-grades, of which there are five for the males. See J. L. Krapf, *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa* (London, 1860), p. 363; C. C. von der Decken, *Reisen in Ost-Afrika* (Leipsic and Heidelberg, 1869–1871), ii. 25.

[1] Claud Hollis, "Notes on the History and Customs of the people of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. 1 (October, 1901), pp. 98, 104 *sqq.*

Sexual communism between members of the same age-grade among the Wataveta.

which are not exogamous, though the sub-clans are so; in other words, a man may marry a woman of his own clan, provided that she does not belong to the same sub-clan as himself.[1] They practise polygamy and among them, as among the Masai, both sexes must be circumcised before marriage, but marriage does not always follow immediately on circumcision. When they have passed through that ordeal, the young people are free to consort with each other in a sort of kraal or assemblage of low, kennel-like huts erected for them in the woods, where they pass the night. No restriction appears to be placed on their intercourse, but all children born in that kraal are put to death at birth. After the operation of circumcision "the youths join one of the groups of the coming generation, according to the number of summers they have seen, or, if no 'age' has yet been formed, they do their utmost to kidnap a daughter of one of the reigning chiefs or one of the latters' contemporaries, and until this has been accomplished they are unable to pass their nights in that haven of bliss, the *Maniata*," that is, in the kraal of the young folk in the woods.[2] Thus it seems that among the Wataveta, as among the Masai, the age-grade to which a man belongs is determined by the time at which he is circumcised.

Sexual relations regulated by age-grades among the Wataveta.

The age-grades apparently regulate sexual relations among the Wataveta in much the same way as among the Masai; for while a degree of licence approaching to group marriage prevails between men and women of corresponding age-grades, members of different age-grades are forbidden to cohabit with each other under pain of penalties which increase in proportion to the difference between their age-grades. Thus adultery is only punishable when the adulterer is not of the same age-grade as the husband of the adulteress; and if a man were to rape the wife of a member of his own age-grade, he could at the most be fined one goat for assault. If the offender belongs to the age-grade immediately subsequent to that of the husband whose wife he has

[1] *Totemism and Exogamy*, ii. 418 *sq.*, from information furnished by Mr. A. C. Hollis in a letter dated Nairobi, East Africa Protectorate, June 15th, 1909.

[2] Claud Hollis, "Notes on the History and Customs of the people of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. 1 (October, 1901), pp. 110-113.

wronged, he is fined a goat; but if the culprit belongs to a later age-grade, say to an age-grade two degrees junior to that of the injured husband, it is considered a serious crime, and the criminal must give the old man an ox. On the other hand, if a member of a senior age-grade commits adultery with the wife of a reigning chief or of one of his contemporaries, he is deprived of all his cattle. And were a member of a senior age-grade to commit fornication with a girl of an age-grade one or two degrees junior to his own, while the girl was resident in the *maniata* or kraal of the young folk in the woods, he would have to atone for his sin by presenting the members of the damsel's age-grade with an ox, which they would slaughter and eat. If he does not pay the fine promptly, the young men of the injured age-grade prophesy that his sin will soon find him out; and so it does, for the sinner's body is commonly discovered a few days later stabbed with a hundred spears.[1] To this account of sexual morality among the Wataveta our informant adds: "I am informed by natives of Moschi and by the Rev. A. R. Steggall that one finds both there and in other Chaga states in Kilima Njaro, situated but a few miles from Taveta, examples of polyandry in which the husbands are all brothers. It is therefore of some interest that almost in the same district in different sections of the population there exist two forms of polyandry; at Taveta a man lends his wives to a comrade of his 'age'; at Moschi, a man's brothers only have an equal right to his women."[2]

The Wataveta kill all children borne by a woman after her daughter's marriage.

The care which the Wataveta take to prevent the cohabitation of men and women belonging to different age-grades may account for a very remarkable custom which they practise. Every child that a woman bears after her daughter's marriage is put to death.[3] No reason is assigned

[1] Claud Hollis, "Notes on the History and Customs of the people of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. 1 (October, 1901), p. 124.

[2] Claud Hollis, *l.c.* Fraternal polyandry seems to be exceedingly rare in Africa, but it occasionally happens among the pastoral Bahima of Ankole, in the Uganda Protectorate, where brothers, who are too poor to keep a wife apiece, sometimes club together to keep one in common. See J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 121.

[3] Claud Hollis, "Notes on the History and Customs of the people of Taveta, East Africa," *Journal of the African Society*, No. 1 (October, 1901), p. 110.

for this massacre of the innocents, but we may conjecture that the motive for the murder is as follows. The children which a woman bears after her daughter's marriage will be contemporary with her daughter's children; in other words, her younger children and her grandchildren will be of the same age, and hence will fall into the same age-grade. But if a woman's daughter and granddaughter are thus placed in the same age-grade, it would obviously be open to any man of the corresponding age-grade to marry or cohabit with them both, thus confounding that distinction between the generations which it seems a principal object of the age-grades to maintain. Whatever the object of this cruel law, a natural effect of it is that a woman delays the marriage of her daughter as long as possible, at least so long as she herself is still capable of bearing children, because she knows that her daughter's wedding may prove a sentence of death on the infant which she herself carries, or hopes to carry, in her womb. Hence she resorts to stratagem to divert the attentions of suitors from her daughter, hanging a leaden bracelet, the sign of betrothal, on the girl's arm long before she is actually betrothed.[1]

Age-grades among the Nandi of British East Africa.

The system of age-grades occurs also among the Nandi, another tribe of British East Africa, who seem, like the Wataveta, to be of mixed origin, combining elements of the Bantu and the Nilotic negro with a dash of pygmy and perhaps of Galla blood.[2] They possess the classificatory system of relationship and are divided into totemic clans, but these clans are not exogamous; in other words, a man is free to marry a woman of his own totemic clan.[3] According to the social system of the Nandi, the male sex is divided into boys, warriors, and elders, the female sex into girls and married women. The first stage is continued till circumcision, which may be performed between the ages of ten and twenty. A circumcision festival for boys should take place, as among their neighbours the Masai, every seven and a half years, but since their removal to a reserve

[1] Claud Hollis, *l.c.*

[2] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi* (Oxford, 1909), p. 1.

[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 4 *sqq.*, 92 *sq.* Similarly we have seen (pp. 325 *sq.*) that among the neighbouring Masai and Wataveta the clans are not exogamous, though the sub-clans are so.

in 1905 the Nandi seem to have altered this custom, and boys are now circumcised every year or so like girls. All boys who are circumcised at the same time are said to belong to the same age-grade (*ipinda*), and there are seven such age-grades in all, giving a total period of about fifty-three years. The age-grades always bear one of the following names (which are taken by their respective members) and succeed one another in the following order :—

Maina, small children.
Nyonge, boys between 10 and 20 years of age.
Kimnyike, men between 18 and 28 years of age.
Kâplelach, men between 26 and 36 years of age.
Kipkoümet, men between 34 and 44 years of age.
Sowe, men between 42 and 52 years of age.
Juma, men between 50 and 60 years of age.

In each age-grade there are three subdivisions called fires, probably because the members of each age-grade associate round their own fires, and do not allow the members of the other age-grades to join them.[1] Similarly among the Masai each age-grade falls into three subdivisions, called respectively "the big ostrich feathers," "the helpers," and "our fleet runners."[2]

Ceremonies observed at circumcision among the Nandi.

The ceremonies at circumcision among the Nandi present some peculiar features ; the boys who are to be operated on are dressed as women, and the girls who are to be operated on are dressed as men, and for some days after being circumcised neither boys nor girls may touch food with their hands, but are obliged to eat out of a half calabash with the help of a leaf of a particular tree. During the second, and very severe, part of the operation performed on boys, barren women and women who have lost several brothers or sisters in quick succession are allowed to be present ; and it is believed that the barren women will afterwards conceive. The severed foreskins are collected by the old men, who pour milk and beer on them and put them away in an ox-horn. Four days later the old men take the foreskins out of the ox-horn, and after offering them to God, bury them in cow-dung at the foot of a particular kind of tree (*Croton sp.*). For four days after circumcision boys continue to wear female

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 11 *sq.* [2] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai*, p. 262.

costume, and after the lapse of that period girls are clothed in long garments which reach to their feet, and cover their heads and faces with masks or cowls which have only two holes in front for the eyes. In the seclusion which they are obliged to observe for some time after undergoing the operation boys are shown the friction drums and the bull-roarers and taught how to play them. On the completion of the ceremonies they are regarded as adults; their spirits live after death; and on their decease their names may be given to members of their families.[1] This naming of a child after a dead man is not an empty compliment; the spirit of the deceased is thought to watch over his namesake and keep him from harm.[2]

Circumcision and the belief in the reincarnation of the dead.

In the mystery which still surrounds the widespread practice of circumcision,[3] the curious observances which attend the rite among the Nandi must remain obscure. The belief in spiritual immortality, which is apparently supposed to be a consequence of circumcision, lends some support to the conjecture that the primary intention of the rite was to ensure the survival of the soul after death in order that at some later time it might be reborn in the family.[4] The Nandi notion that the spirit of a dead man, after whom an infant is named, acts as the child's spiritual guardian, may be only a modification of an older notion that the dead man's spirit is actually incarnate in his living namesake. The belief that the souls of dead relatives are born again in their namesakes appears to be widespread among mankind.[5] The Kayans of Borneo think that "the soul of a grandfather may pass into one of his grandchildren, and an old man will try to secure the passage of his soul to a favourite grandchild by holding it above his head from time to time. The grandfather usually gives up his name to his eldest grandson, and reassumes the original name of

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 52-60, 68.

[2] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, p. 66.

[3] For evidence as to the diffusion of circumcision among many races, see Richard Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche*, Neue Folge (Leipsic, 1889), pp. 166-212.

[4] This conjecture I have put forward tentatively in *The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings*, i. 92 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part i.).

[5] Compare (Sir) E. B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Second Edition (London, 1873), ii. 3 *sqq.*; *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, pp. 365 *sqq.*; *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 297 *sqq.*

his childhood with the prefix or title *Laki*, and the custom seems to be connected with this belief or hope."[1] Here the grandfather only anticipates matters by bestowing in his lifetime his name on the grandchild in whose person his soul is to be reborn after his death.[2] In Nukahiva, one of the Marquesas Islands, every one believes, or rather used to believe, "that the soul of a grandfather is transmitted by Nature into the body of his grandchildren; and that, if an unfruitful wife were to place herself under the corpse of her deceased grandfather, she would be sure to become pregnant."[3] Similarly we have seen that among the Nandi a barren woman is supposed to conceive through attending at the second part of a boy's circumcision; apparently the operation is thought to have the effect of liberating a human soul, which will seek to be born again in the first disengaged woman it may encounter.

Circumcision in relation to age-grades.

But to inquire into the origin and meaning of circumcision would lead us too far from our present subject. We must be content with the observation that among the Nandi and other kindred tribes the age-grade to which a man belongs is determined by the time at which he is circumcised. The operation is therefore of fundamental importance for fixing the social position, rights, and duties of all members of the community.

Transference of government from one age-grade to another among the Nandi.

At intervals of about seven and a half years the guardianship of the Nandi country is solemnly transferred from the men of one age-grade, now grown old, to the men of the age-grade immediately succeeding. The ceremony at which the transference takes place is one of the most important in the Nandi annals. All the adult male population, so far as possible, gather at a certain spot; but no married warrior may attend, nor may he or his wife leave their houses while the ceremony is being performed. The Chief Medicine Man (*Orkoiyot*) must be present; and the ceremony opens with the sacrifice of a white bullock, which is purchased by the young warriors for the occasion. After the meat has been

[1] Charles Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo* (London, 1912), ii. 47.

[2] On the practice of naming children after their grandparents, in connexion with the belief in the transmigration of souls, see *Totemism and Exogamy*, iii. 298 *sq.*

[3] U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage round the World* (London, 1814), p. 89.

eaten by the old men, each of the young men makes a small ring out of the hide, and puts it on one of the fingers of his right hand. A circle is then formed round the Chief Medicine Man, who stands near a stool, about which is heaped cow dung studded with the fruit of the *lapotuet* shrub (*Solanum campylanthum*). All the old men and the members of the age-grade immediately preceding the one in power stand up, whilst the warriors who are going to receive the control of the country sit down. On a sign from the Chief Medicine Man the members of the preceding age-grade strip themselves of their warrior's garments and don the fur robes of old men. The warriors of the age in power, that is, those who were circumcised about four years before, are then solemnly informed that the safety of the country and the welfare of the people are committed to their hands, and they are exhorted to guard the land of their fathers. After that the people disperse to their homes.[1]

Age-grades among the Akamba and Akikuyu of British East Africa.

Age-grades also occur among the Akamba and the Akikuyu, two large tribes of British East Africa, but apparently in both tribes the system is in decay, since admission to the various grades is conditional on the payment of fees.[2] Both tribes practise circumcision as a necessary preliminary to the attainment of full membership of the tribes.[3] Among the Akikuyu the rite used to be combined with a solemn pretence of a new birth, the candidate for initiation making believe to be born again from his mother or from another woman, if his real mother happened to be dead. Girls as well as boys had to submit to the ceremony of the new birth, which has now been detached from the rite of circumcision, but it is still compulsory and universal in all the clans, as a stage through which every man and woman must pass

[1] A. C. Hollis, *The Nandi*, pp. 12 *sq.*

[2] H. R. Tate, "Notes on the Kikuyu and Kamba tribes of British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxiv. (1904) pp. 133, 138; C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 49; Hon. Ch. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 539-541; *id.*, "The Organization and Laws of some Tribes in East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlv. (1915) pp. 241 *sqq.*; W. Scoresby Routledge and K. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People* (London, 1910), pp. 197 *sqq.*

[3] C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes*, pp. 68 *sqq.*; W. Scoresby Routledge and K. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, pp. 154 *sqq.*

at some period of their life. Any one who has not gone through it is debarred from inheriting property or taking any part in the religious rites of the country; a man, for example, who has not been born again may not assist in the disposal of his father's body after death nor help to carry him out into the wilds to breath his last. This sacrament, as we may call it, of the new birth appears to be generally partaken of at about the age of ten, but sometimes it is administered to infants.[1]

Age-grades among the Suk of British East Africa.

Another tribe of British East Africa which is divided into age-grades is the Suk. They are a people of mixed origin, closely akin to the Nandi in language and customs. Their system of age-grades in particular resembles that of the Nandi, as will appear from the following account:—

"Socially the Suk are roughly divided into *Kara-chon-a*, or 'boys'; *Muren*, or full-grown circumcised men; and *Poi*, or old men. There are a number of ages, *Pĕn*, the duration of each being a generation, or roughly fifteen years. These ages, as with the Nandi, run in cycles. Circumcision takes place whenever there are sufficient candidates, generally about once in three years, but any one circumcised during the generation of fifteen years is said to belong to the same age. Nor can a man be said to belong to an age at all until he has been circumcised. Thus *Maina* is the age of those most recently circumcised, and comprises youths between the ages of about fifteen and thirty. *Nyongu*, the next age, consists of comparatively old men between the ages of thirty and forty-five; while the oldest men living probably belong to the age of *Merkutwa*. Any one older than sixty would belong to *Kablelach*. Besides these, four other ages are still spoken about in narrating tales, folklore, etc. Thus the generation older than *Kablelach*, *i.e.* older than seventy-five years, of whom there would almost certainly be no one living, is spoken of as *Kip-koimet*. Prior to that is *Karongoro*; prior to that *Sowa*; and most ancient of all, *Jumo*. After *Jumo* the age cycle begins again with *Maina*. The seniors of each age are called *Nerkau* or *Chagen-ōpero*, those in the

[1] W. Scoresby Routledge and K. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, pp. 151 *sqq.*; C. W. Hobley, "Kikuyu Customs and Beliefs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 440 *sq.* On the rite of the new birth see above, pp. 7 *sqq.*

middle *Ñgiru*, and the juniors *Nimur*. Once circumcised, a youth remains a 'warrior' until the day of his death or incapacity to fight further. The care of the country is not entrusted to any particular age; consequently there is no elaborate handing-over ceremony as with Masai and Nandi. Women are circumcised at irregular intervals, and become included in the 'age' of the men they marry."[1]

Correspondence of the age-grades among the Suk, Nandi, and Masai.

Thus among the Suk, as among the Nandi and Masai, the rite of circumcision forms, as it were, the pivot on which the system of age-grades revolves; the period of an age-grade, about fifteen years, corresponds to one age-grade of the Nandi and two age-grades or one generation of the Masai; and each age-grade falls into three subdivisions according to seniority and juniority. One curious feature in the age-grades of the Suk is their multiplication beyond the ordinary, and perhaps even the extraordinary, limits of human life. The motive for such an extension is not obvious. As these superhuman ages are said to occur in tales and folk-lore, they may perhaps be related, whether as cause or effect, to a belief, like that of the Hebrews, that the patriarchs of old attained to degrees of longevity far exceeding the short span of existence enjoyed by men in modern times.

Totemism and exogamy among the Suk.

The Suk are divided into clans, which are both totemic and exogamous, with paternal descent of the totem; in other words, each clan has its totem, no man may marry a woman of his own clan, and children take their clan and their totem from their father, not from their mother.[2]

Age-grades among the Turkana of British East Africa.

Yet another people of British East Africa who possess a system of age-grades are the Turkana. They are a tribe of very mixed origin who speak a language like that of the Masai, but have little in common with their neighbours the Suk, though the two tribes are often classed together as closely allied. Each sex among the Turkana is divided into three age-grades. The first age-grade of the males is that of the young boy (*nidue*); the second is that of the

[1] Mervyn W. H. Beech, *The Suk, their Language and Folklore* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 5 *sq.*

[2] Hon. K. R. Dundas, "Notes on the Tribes inhabiting the Baringo District, East Africa Protectorate," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) p. 59; Mervyn W. H. Beech, *The Suk*, p. 5.

warrior (*egile*); and the third is that of the old man (*kasikou*). The corresponding age-grades of the women are called *apesur*, *aberu*, and *agemat*. The generations of warriors are called *asavanissia*. Each generation, as it attains the warrior's age, is given a distinctive name. Apparently a new age is created about every four or five years. Unlike all the other tribes of this region which possess the system of age-grades, the Turkana do not practise circumcision. They are divided into exogamous clans, but there is no evidence that the clans are totemic.[1]

Age-grades among the Gallas.

Some traces of a system of age-grades have been recorded among the Gallas.[2]

Age-grades among the Mohammedans of Wadai.

At a much higher stage of culture the system of age-grades is found among the Mohammedan population of Wadai, in the Central Sudan. The males are there divided according to age into five grades, and in the larger villages there are public huts set apart for the use of old men and mature men respectively.[3] But in the stage of a survival from savagery among civilized or semi-civilized people the institution cannot be expected to retain its primitive features, and an examination of it can hardly throw light on the origin of the custom.

Age-grades associated with sexual communism both in New Guinea and Africa.

From this survey of the system of age-grades it appears that both in New Guinea and among the wilder tribes of Africa the institution is associated with a form of sexual communism, all the members of an age-grade exercising or claiming marital rights over women of their own age-grade, with the exception of such women as are barred to them by the laws of consanguinity or of exogamy. Finding this association of sexual communism with age-grades among comparatively primitive tribes in distant parts of the world,

[1] Hon. K. R. Dundas, "Notes on the Tribes inhabiting the Baringo District, East Africa Protectorate," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910) pp. 66 *sq.* The Makonde of German East Africa are reported to possess the system of age-grades, the males being divided into five classes according to their age, from infancy to old age. See Karl Weule, *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse meiner ethnographischen Forschungsreise in den Südosten Deutsch-Ostafrikas* (Berlin, 1898), pp. 115 *sq.*

[2] Ph. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas, die Materielle Cultur der Danâkil, Galla und Somâl* (Berlin, 1893), p. 194; H. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde* (Berlin, 1902), pp. 135 *sqq.*

[3] Gustav Nachtigal, *Sahârâ und Sûdân*, iii. (Leipsic, 1889), pp. 245 *sqq.*; H. Schurtz, *Altersklassen und Männerbünde*, pp. 139 *sq.*

we may with some probability infer that the association has been at some time or another a universal characteristic of age-grades, wherever that classification of society is found among savages. Thus by a third line of evidence we are led to infer the existence, present or past, of sexual communism or group marriage on a great scale in a large portion of the human race. The three lines of evidence which point to that conclusion are, first, the classificatory or group system of relationship; second, the combination of the sororate with the levirate; and, third, the institution of age-grades. The convergence of three distinct lines of argument naturally strengthens our confidence in the conclusion to which they all point.

Converging evidence of former sexual communism on a large scale in the human race.

Perhaps, too, we can now frame to ourselves a clearer idea of the social conditions which regulated marriage according to the seniority or juniority of the parties concerned. Among the lower races it appears to be the general, indeed almost invariable, rule that men and women marry at the earliest opportunity afforded them by age and the customs of the society in which they live. The practice of deferring marriage from purely prudential motives is characteristic of the civilized races, it is practically unknown among the uncivilized; it implies on the material side an accumulation of property, on the intellectual side a foresight, and on the moral side a self-control, which are only to be found in wealthy, intelligent, and temperate communities, but which we should vainly look for among poor, improvident, and intemperate savages, as well as among those members of civilized communities who most nearly resemble savages in their lack not only of wealth but of intelligence and self-restraint. Accordingly in primitive society, where almost every man marries as soon as he can, the unmarried state is looked upon with astonishment and disfavour as something abnormal and reprehensible, not only because it seems to run counter to one of the strongest instincts of our animal nature, but because it tends to weaken the community by depriving it of the recruits which it requires for its maintenance and defence against enemies. Hence we can understand the disapproval with which the marriage of younger brothers and sisters before their elders has been

Social conditions which regulate marriage according to seniority and juniority. The rule that a younger brother or sister may not marry before his or her elder brother or sister seems to point to a social disapprobation of seniors, whether men or women, who remain unmarried.

visited by so many races. In all such cases the real culprit, we may surmise, is not the younger brother or sister who marries, but the elder brother or sister who neglects the promptings of nature and the claims of society by remaining unmarried; and his negligence is all the more conspicuous under social conditions which subject him to ordeals and observances of various kinds specially designed as a preparation for marriage. For example, in tribes which compel all their members, male and female, to be circumcised, there is no doubt that the rite of circumcision is regarded as a necessary preliminary to the married state; and if after submitting to the operation, as he must do, a man continues unmarried when he might have taken to himself a wife, he is naturally looked upon by his fellows as a sort of anomaly or contradiction, bearing the badge of marriage on his person but failing to enjoy the privileges and to discharge the duties which that badge imports. And a like verdict of condemnation is passed for similar reasons on any woman who, after passing through the prescribed ordeal, persists in celibacy, though she is both legally and physically capable of being a wife and a mother.

The same social disapprobation of seniors who remain unmarried may explain the Urabunna rule of marriage with the daughter either of the mother's elder brother or of the father's elder sister.

The same considerations perhaps suffice to explain the Urabunna rule that a man should marry his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's elder brother or of his father's elder sister, but not his cross-cousin, the daughter either of his mother's younger brother or of his father's younger sister.[1] For under ordinary circumstances the daughters of a mother's elder brother or of a father's elder sister will be older than their cross-cousins, the daughters of a mother's younger brother or of a father's younger sister; and in virtue of the rule, practically universal among savages, that women should marry at the earliest opportunity, it seems clearly incumbent on a man to marry his elder cross-cousins before his younger cross-cousins, just as it is incumbent on him to marry an elder sister before a younger sister. Hence it would commonly happen that a man would be expected to marry the daughters of his mother's elder brother or of his father's elder sister in preference to the daughters of his mother's younger brother or of his father's younger sister; and this

[1] See above, p. 187.

preference for marriage with the senior branch of the family might develop into the absolute injunction of marriage with the senior branch and the absolute prohibition of marriage with the junior branch of the mother's or the father's family.

The prohibition to marry a wife's elder sisters perhaps rests on the supposition that these sisters are already married to other men.

Again, the prohibition to marry a wife's elder sisters may rest on the assumption that these women already have husbands and therefore cannot be taken to wife by another man; while on the other hand the permission to marry any or all of a wife's younger sisters is most naturally derived, as I have attempted to show, from a system of communal marriage in which a group of brothers is married to a group of sisters. On that theory, it is obvious, the prohibition and the permission to some extent clash with each other; for if a man is bound to marry an elder sister first, and has the right to marry all her younger sisters afterwards, how comes it that any of these sisters can be married to another man? The answer is implicitly given in some of the cases which came before us:[1] though a man in many tribes has the right to marry his wife's younger sisters, he does not always exercise the right, but is sometimes willing to transfer it to other men, perhaps on receipt of a valuable consideration.

Suggested explanation of the rules regulating marriage with a brother's widow.

Lastly, we have to explain, why a man is commonly allowed or even obliged to marry the widow of his deceased elder brother, but is commonly forbidden to marry the widow of his deceased younger brother. The explanation both of the permission and of the prohibition is perhaps to be sought in that form of communal marriage which I suppose to lie at the base of the levirate as well as of the sororate, namely, the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters.

Why a man may marry his elder brother's widow.

On that supposition, as fast as a man's younger brothers grow up they join the group of husbands formed by their elder brothers; and as fast as younger sisters grow up they join the group of wives formed by their elder sisters. Thus a younger brother is entitled to use his elder brother's wife in the lifetime of his elder brother, and naturally continues to enjoy her after his elder brother's death. When with the growth of sexual jealousy men refused any longer to share their wives with their brothers, the elder brother claimed for himself all the sisters whom he had formerly held in common

[1] Above, pp. 266, 270, 272, 278, 297, 300, 302, 303.

with his younger brothers, but on his death he allowed his wives to pass by inheritance to his next younger brother, who on his death passed the women on to his next younger brother, and so on, until all the brothers in turn, one after the other in order of seniority, had married the wives of their eldest brother. In this manner we can conceive the custom of the levirate to have originated.

Why a man may not marry his younger brother's widow.

But if in this way we can account for the permission to marry an elder brother's widow, how are we to explain the prohibition to marry a younger brother's widow? The rule is to be compared with the Santal rule which forbids a man to take any liberties with a younger brother's wife in the lifetime of the younger brother, while it allows him to take any liberties with an elder brother's wife in the lifetime of the elder brother.[1] Together the two rules point to the conclusion, that when a younger brother marries a wife who is not one of the group of sisters over whom his elder brother has full marital rights, that wife does not join the group of communal wives composed of sisters, and that consequently the eldest brother may neither have intercourse with her during his younger brother's life nor marry her after his death. On this view, while the permission to marry an elder brother's widow is a relic of group marriage, the prohibition to marry a younger brother's widow marks an early step in the disintegration of group marriage, having been brought about by the growth of sexual jealousy and the consequent reluctance of brothers to share their wives with each other. This explanation of the prohibition to marry a younger brother's widow is purely conjectural, but it may be allowed to stand till a better has been suggested.

Two later types of levirate, the economic and the religious.

On this view the levirate, like the sororate, originated in a particular form of group marriage, namely in the marriage of a group of brothers to a group of sisters. But when the levirate survived, as it often did, among peoples who had left group marriage far behind them, it would naturally assume a different character with its changed surroundings. Thus wherever the rights of property and the practice of purchasing wives had become firmly established, the tendency would be to regard the widow as a valuable part of the inheritance,

[1] Above, pp. 306 *sq.*

who, having been bought and paid for, could not be allowed to pass out of the family but must go to the heir, whether he be a brother, a son, or other relation of the deceased husband. This, for example, appears to be the current view of the levirate in Africa, where the custom is commonly observed.[1] Again, wherever it came to be supposed that a man's eternal welfare in the other world depends on his leaving children behind him, who will perform the rites necessary for his soul's salvation, it naturally became the pious duty of the survivors to remedy, as far as they could, the parlous state of a kinsman who had died without offspring, and on none would that duty appear to be more incumbent than on the brother of the deceased. In such circumstances the old custom of the levirate might be continued, or perhaps revived, with the limitation which we find in Hebrew and Hindoo law, namely that a brother must marry his brother's widow only in the case where the deceased died childless, and only for the purpose of begetting on the widow a son or sons for him who had left none of his own. Hence what had at one time been regarded as a right of succession to be enjoyed by the heir, might afterwards come to be viewed as a burdensome and even repulsive obligation imposed upon a surviving brother or other kinsman, who submitted to it reluctantly out of a sense of duty to the dead. This is the light in which the levirate was considered by Hindoo legislators.[2]

[1] A. H. Post, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz* (Oldenburg and Leipsic, 1887), i. 419-425. So, too, in Melanesia (above, pp. 300 *sq.*).

[2] *Laws of Manu*, ix. 59-68 (G. Bühler's translation, pp. 337-339, *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxv. Oxford, 1886); *Gautama, Institutes of the Sacred Law*, xviii. 4-14 (G. Bühler's translation, *The Sacred Laws of the Âryas*, Part i. pp. 267 *sq.* *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ii. Oxford, 1879); *Vasishtha*, xviii. 55-65 (G. Bühler's translation, *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, Part ii. pp. 89-91, *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiv. Oxford, 1882); Julius Jolly, *Recht und Sitte* (Strasburg, 1896), pp. 70 *sq.* (in G. Bühler's *Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*); J. F. McLennan and D. McLennan, *The Patriarchal Theory* (London, 1885), pp. 156 *sqq.*, 266 *sqq.* The distinction between what may be called the religious and the economic types of levirate is drawn very clearly in the following passage, from which we learn that the religious levirate is now extinct in India, while the economic levirate continues to flourish there: "*Niyoga* was an ancient custom among the Hindus, by which a childless widow often raised a son to her dead husband through the agency of her dead husband's brother, or sometimes a *Rishi*. . . . The idea was to have a son (*putra*) to offer libations to the dead husband to save him from the terrible hell (*put*).

In its original form the levirate is directly derived from a form of group marriage, in which the husbands were brothers.

Thus, according to the predominance of purely economic or of purely religious motives, the levirate may dwindle or develop either into a mercenary transaction, as in modern Africa, or into a pious duty, as in ancient India. But that neither the mercenary nor the religious aspect of the custom is original and fundamental seems to follow from the nature of the levirate as it is practised by the aborigines of Australia, the lowest savages about whose institutions we possess exact information; for these people neither buy their wives and transmit them like chattels to their heirs, nor do they believe in a heaven in which the dead can only secure and keep a footing through the good offices of their living descendants. Accordingly we must look for another explanation of their custom of handing over a widow to her deceased husband's brother, and such an explanation lies to our hand in the old custom of group marriage, which still survives, or survived down to recent years, in some backward tribes.

Hence (1) *Niyoga* was only allowed to a childless widow; (2) not more than one son was allowed; and (3) the son belonged not to his real father but to the dead husband of his mother. No trace of this custom in its entirety is found anywhere in India now. . . But a brother's taking to wife his elder brother's wife is looked upon as a matter of course, and the children of the union are treated as legitimate. And this is a younger brother's special right; for, if a widow goes to live with some other man (as concubine, for remarriage is not permitted), the younger brother can demand payment of the bride-price from the new husband. This custom, however, cannot have been derived from *Niyoga*, for there is no idea of raising children to the dead husband—the children of the union belong to the begetter, and therefore, even widows having sons can become the wives of their dead husband's brothers. Nor is union with a stranger permitted, as in *Niyoga*. The custom is far more probably a survival of polyandry, at least in the hills, for the widow does not 'marry' the brother —there is no ceremony—but she simply begins to live with him as his wife. And even during the lifetime of her husband, a woman's *liaison* with her husband's younger brother is not visited with the same punishment as with a third person." See Panna Lall, "An enquiry into the Birth and Marriage Customs of the Khasiyas and the Bottiyas of Almora District, U.P.," *The Indian Antiquary*, xl. (Bombay, 1911), pp. 191 *sq.*

McLennan proposed to derive the levirate from fraternal polyandry of the sort which is practised in Tibet. Against this it is to be said, that while the levirate is very common, fraternal polyandry is very rare; for example, it appears to be totally absent from aboriginal Australia and very exceptional in Africa, in both of which regions the levirate is widespread. Accordingly we must look for the cause of the levirate, not in an exceptional institution like fraternal polyandry, but in an institution of wide prevalence such as group marriage appears to have been. Compare *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. 501 *sqq.*

§ 17. *Serving for a Wife.*

How Jacob served Laban, his father-in-law, for his two wives.

Although Jacob may have had a prior claim on the hands of his cousins Leah and Rachel, the daughters of his mother's brother Laban, he might not marry them for nothing; far from it, he had to serve his father-in-law as a shepherd and a goatherd for seven years for each of his cousins, making a period of fourteen years of service in all for the two. At the end of the time, having earned his wives and his children by his services, Jacob desired to return with them from Haran to his own country, the land of his father Israel. But his father-in-law had found him to be a valuable servant, and was unwilling to let him go; so he persuaded Jacob to stay with him and serve as a shepherd and goatherd for another period of years. During this third period of service, which lasted six years, the patriarch by his craft as well as his skill acquired immense flocks of sheep and goats, with which he returned a rich man to his native land.[1]

His period of service equivalent to payment.

From this narrative it clearly follows that Jacob was believed to have earned his wives in exactly the same way as he earned his flocks, namely by serving his father-in-law for them. The fourteen years' service was reckoned equal to the value of two wives, just as six years' service was reckoned equal to so many heads of sheep and goats. In other words, Jacob paid for his wives in labour instead of in money or in kind. The affair, apart from the genuine love which Jacob felt for one of his wives, was substantially a commercial transaction between two sharp men, each of whom attempted successfully to cheat the other. The virtuous indignation which each of the two rogues felt, or affected, at the rascality of the other is a delicate stroke of satire in the manner of Molière.

The practice of earning a wife by serving her parents instead of paying them for her is common in the world.

If any doubt could subsist as to the true light in which Jacob's service for his wives is to be regarded, it may be dispelled by a comparison with the marriage customs of peoples in many parts of the world; for an examination of these customs will satisfy us that it is a common practice for the parents of a girl to accept the services of a son-in-

[1] Genesis xxix.-xxxi.

law instead of a direct payment for their daughter's hand. We have to bear in mind that at a certain stage of social evolution a wife is valued, not merely as a companion and a mother of children, but also as a labourer, who contributes in large measure to the support of the family. Hence her parents naturally refuse to part with her except for a valuable consideration, which may take the form of a woman given in exchange, or of a payment in money, or of services rendered for a longer or shorter period by the man who marries the daughter. The practice of bartering women as wives has been illustrated by the custom of exchanging sisters or daughters in marriage.[1] It remains to illustrate the practice of procuring wives by service as a substitute for the payment of a bride price.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Gonds of the Central Provinces of India.

Thus among the Gonds of the Central Provinces of India "polygamy is not forbidden; but, women being costly chattels, it is rarely practised. The father of the bride is always paid a consideration for the loss of her services, as is usually the case among poor races where the females bear a large share in the burden of life. The Biblical usage of the bridegroom, when too poor to pay this consideration in cash, serving in the house of his future father-in-law for a certain time, is universal among the tribes. The youth is then called a *lamjan*; and it frequently happens that he gets tired of waiting, and induces his fair one to make a moonlight flitting of it."[3] To the same effect a more recent authority on the Gonds tells us "the practice of Lamsena, or serving for a wife, is commonly adopted by boys who cannot afford to buy one. The bridegroom serves his prospective father-in-law for an agreed period, usually three to five or even six years, and at its expiry he should be married to the girl without expense. During this time he is not supposed to have access to the girl, but frequently they become intimate, and if this happens

[1] Above, pp. 195 *sqq.*, 210 *sqq.*

[2] With what follows compare A. H. Post, *Die Anfänge des Staats- und Rechtslebens* (Oldenburg, 1878), pp. 28 *sqq.*; *id.*, *Bausteine für eine allgemeine Rechtswissenschaft* (Oldenburg, 1880-1881), i. 113 *sqq.*; *id.*, *Afrikanische Jurisprudenz* (Oldenburg and Leipsic, 1887), i. 378 *sq.*; *id.*, *Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz* (Oldenburg and Leipsic, 1894-1895), i. 318 *sqq.*; E. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage* (London, 1891), pp. 390-392.

[3] Captain J. Forsyth, *The Highlands of Central India* (London, 1871), pp. 148 *sq.*

the boy may either stay and serve his unexpired term or take his wife away at once; in the latter case his parents should pay the girl's father five rupees for each year of the bridegroom's unexpired service. The Lamsena custom does not work well as a rule, since the girl's parents can break their contract, and the Lamsena has no means of redress. Sometimes if they are offered a good bride price they will marry the girl to another suitor when he has served the greater part of his term, and all his work goes for nothing."[1] Here the exact equivalence of the service to the bride price, and the purely mercenary character of the whole transaction, are sufficiently obvious.

Serving for a wife among other tribes of the Central Provinces of India.

Again, among the Kawars, a primitive hill tribe of the Central Provinces of India, a man normally pays for his bride, but "it is permissible for two families to effect an exchange of girls in lieu of payment of the bride price, this practice being known as *gunrāwat*. Or a prospective bridegroom may give his services for three or four years instead of a price. The system of serving for a wife is known as *gharjiān*"; it is generally favoured by widows who have daughters to dispose of.[2] This case is instructive, for it shows the equivalence of purchase, exchange, and service as modes of procuring a wife. Among the Khonds, a Dravidian tribe of the Central Provinces of India, notorious for the human sacrifices which they used to offer for the sake of the crops, wives are usually bought and sold. The price of a bride used to be very high, as much as from twelve to twenty head of cattle, but in some places it has now fallen very considerably. If a man cannot afford to purchase a bride, he may, like Jacob, serve his prospective father-in-law for seven years as the condition of obtaining her hand.[3] Among the Korkus, a Munda or Kolarian tribe of the Central Provinces of India, who used to live by hunting and a migratory system of cultivation, if a man has only one daughter, or if he requires some one to help him on the farm, he will often make his future son-in-law serve for his wife for a period varying from five to twelve years, at the end of which he bestows his

[1] R. V. Russell, *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London, 1916), iii. 80.

[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 395.

[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 467.

daughter on the faithful suitor, liberally celebrating the wedding at his own expense. Should, however, the swain tire of the long period of service, and run away with the girl before its expiry, his parents must pay the girl's father five rupees for each year of the unexpired term.[1] Among the Mahars, a menial caste of the Central Provinces of India, the custom of serving for a wife is recognized and bears a special name (*Lamjhana*); the expectant son-in-law lives with his future father-in-law, and works for him for a period varying from one to five years.[2] Again, in the same province "the Marārs of Bālāghāt and Bhandāra have the *lamjhana* form of marriage, in which the prospective husband serves for his wife; this is a Dravidian custom and shows their connection with the forest tribes."[3] Similarly, among the Patlias, a jungle tribe of the Central India Agency, "it is not uncommon for a man to work for his bride, acting as the servant of his father-in-law. Seven years is the usual period. No payment is made for the bride in this case. After seven years the couple are given a separate house and means to cultivate, whereas, up to then, clothing and food only are given them." If a man prefers to buy his wife rather than to work for her, he must pay her father a sum of money, which comes usually to about fourteen rupees.[4]

Serving for a wife in other parts of India.

Among the Gonds of the Eastern Ghauts, in the Madras Presidency, a poor man who cannot afford to pay the usual price for a wife will agree to work instead for a fixed period in the house of his future father-in-law. Such a man is called in the Oriya language *ghorojavai* or "house son-in-law." The term of years for which he labours usually does not exceed three. During that time he helps his father-in-law in agriculture and other work, but he holds no intercourse with his future bride, and he lives in a separate hut adjoining her father's house. At the end of the period that has been agreed upon the marriage is performed in the house of the bride's parents and at their expense. After that, the couple continue to reside for another year with the bride's family, the husband working for his father-in-law as before. Then

[1] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iii. 558 *sq.*
[2] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iv. 133 *sq.*
[3] R. V. Russell, *op. cit.* iv. 166.
[4] Captain C. E. Luard, *The Ethnographical Survey of the Central India Agency*, Monograph II., *The Jungle Tribes of Malwa* (Lucknow, 1909), pp. 46, 47.

they set up a house of their own, generally in the husband's village, to which they repair. At their departure it is customary to present them with new clothes, rice, a pot of liquor, and any cash that the young wife's parents can spare.[1] Among the Santals of Bengal brides are usually purchased from their parents; but if for any reason a daughter has not been sought in marriage, her father will sometimes procure for her what is called a "Home Bridegroom" (*ghardi jawae*). For this purpose he employs a go-between to look out for a needy young man, who will be glad to get a wife without having to pay for her. If the youth consents to the arrangement, he takes up his abode in the house of his parents-in-law and is married very quietly and unostentatiously, for such a marriage is thought to reflect unfavourably on the personal charms of the bride. The young couple live with the wife's parents for five years, receiving food and clothing in return for their labour. When the period has expired, the son-in-law receives a present of a yoke of oxen, a cow and a calf, a bundle of rice, and an axe, and with these and the wife's savings the two set up as farmers in a small way on their own account.[2] Again, among the Kirantis of the Central Himalayas the practice is to buy wives, usually at from five-and-twenty to thirty rupees a head; but if a man has neither the money nor the copper utensils which are often accepted instead of cash, he will go and earn his bride by labouring in her father's family.[3] Similarly, among the Mandadan Chettis of Southern India, between the Neilgherry District and Malabar, a young man is sometimes made to work for his bride for a period varying from one to five years, the precise length of which is settled by the council. In such a case the father-in-law defrays the cost of the wedding, and sets up the young couple with a house and some land.[4]

[1] C. Hayavadana Rao, "The Gonds of the Eastern Ghauts, India," *Anthropos*, v. (1910) pp. 794 *sq.*

[2] Hon. and Rev. A. Campbell, D.D., "Santal Marriage Customs," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, ii. (Bankipore, 1916) pp. 328 *sq.*; compare *id.*, "Position of Women among the Santals," *ibid.* pp. 245 *sq.*; *id.*, "Santal rules of Succession and Partition," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, i. (Bankipore, 1915) p. 24.

[3] Brian Houghton Hodgson, *Miscellaneous Essays relating to Indian Subjects* (London, 1880), i. 402.

[4] Edgar Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras, 1909), iv. 445.

The Abbé Dubois on the custom of serving for a wife in India.

Thus the custom of serving for a wife appears to be not uncommon in India, particularly among the Dravidian tribes. One good authority, the Abbé Dubois, even speaks of the custom as if it were generally practised by all men who are too poor to purchase a wife. His observations refer chiefly to Southern India, especially to the Madras Presidency; but, even so limited, they are probably not of universal application. He says, "As the marriage expenses are considerable, we find in all castes a number of young men destitute of the means of defraying them who, in order to procure a wife, resort to the same expedient which Jacob employed with Laban. Like that holy patriarch, an Indian who has no fortune enters the service of one of his relations or of any other person of his caste who has marriageable daughters, and he engages to serve him gratuitously for a number of years on condition that at the end of the time he obtains the hand of one of the daughters. When the term agreed upon has expired, the father fulfils his engagement, pays all the expenses of the marriage, and then allows the wedded pair to retire where they please. In sending them away he gives them a cow, a yoke of oxen, two copper vases, one for drinking and the other for eating, and a quantity of grain sufficient to support them during the first year of their married life. But the remarkable thing is, that the number of years of service required in India in order to get a wife on these conditions is the same as that for which Jacob engaged to serve Laban, that is, seven years." [1] However, the examples I have quoted sufficiently prove that the period of serving for a wife is by no means uniform in modern India, whatever it may have been in ancient Israel.

Serving for a wife among the Lepchas and Limboos of Sikhim and Nepaul.

The custom of serving for a wife instead of paying for her is common also among the Mongoloid tribes of North-Eastern India. Thus, among the Lepchas of Sikhim marriages "are not contracted in childhood, as among the Hindoos, nor do the men generally marry young. This arises principally from the difficulty of procuring means of paying the parents of the bride the expected douceur on giving the suitor his daughter to wife; this sum varies from

[1] J. A. Dubois, *Mœurs, Institutions et Cérémonies des Peuples de l'Inde* (Paris, 1825), i. 295 *sq.*

40 rupees to 400 or 500, according to the rank of the parties. It is not customary to allow the bride to leave her parents' home for that of her husband until the sum agreed on has been paid in full; hence as the consummation of the marriage is permitted while the female is still under her father's roof, it is by no means uncommon to find the husband the temporary bondsman of his father-in-law, who exacts, Jewish fashion, labour from his son in lieu of money until he shall have fairly won his bride."[1] Here, again, the nature of the transaction is obvious; service rendered by a son-in-law to his father-in-law is merely a substitute for the pecuniary payment which the suitor is too poor to make for his bride. Among the Limboos of Sikhim and Nepaul the price of a wife rarely exceeds ten or twelve rupees, yet a bridegroom is often too poor to pay even this paltry sum, and he is obliged to remain with his father-in-law and work for him until he has redeemed his bride.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Kuki-Lushais of Assam.

Again, among the Kuki-Lushais of Assam, "the preliminaries to an ordinary marriage are as follows: A man having taken a fancy to a girl, offers a present of liquor to the parents and talks the matter over. Should they be willing to accept him as a son-in-law, he takes up his abode with them for three years, working in the *jhúms*, and practically becoming a bondservant. At the end of this period he is allowed to marry the girl, but even then is not free, as he has to remain on another two seasons, working in the same manner as he did before. At the completion of the five years he is free to build a separate house and start life on his own account. Two rupees is the sum ordinarily paid the parents of the girl, a sum paid evidently more for the purpose of proving a contract than for anything else, the long period of servitude being the real price paid."[3] However, among

[1] A. Campbell, "Note on the Lepchas of Sikhim," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, ix. Part i. (January to June, 1840), p. 384. Compare Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker, *Himalayan Journals* (London, 1891), p. 91; E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1872), p. 102.

[2] A. Campbell, "Note on the Limboos, and other Hill Tribes hitherto undescribed," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, ix. Part i. (January to June, 1840) pp. 602 *sq.* Compare E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 104.

[3] C. A. Soppitt, *A Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes on the North-East Frontier* (Shillong, 1887), pp. 14 *sq.* Compare Major John Butler, *Travels and Adventures in the Pro-*

the Kukai-Lushai tribes the custom varies somewhat. The Thadoi tribes prefer marriage by purchase, and the price of a wife varies from 20 to over 200 rupees, according to the means of the parents. On the other hand, the Rangkhol tribe prefers marriage by service; the bridegroom resides from three to seven years in his future father-in-law's house, during which time he is allowed free access to the girl of his choice.[1]

Serving for a wife among the Bodos and Mikirs of Assam.

In the Bodo group of tribes in Assam marriage is by purchase or servitude, and sometimes also by capture. The price paid for a bride usually varies from 60 to 100 rupees, but when the suitor is too poor to pay the sum demanded, he frequently enters the house of his parents-in-law and works for them for three or four years.[2] So among the Assamese, "it is not uncommon, when a man is poverty stricken, to engage to live and work for several years for the father of the girl he wishes to marry. He is then called a *chapunea*, a kind of bondsman, and is entitled to receive *bhat kupper*, food and clothing, but no wages; and at the expiration of the period of servitude, if the girl does not dislike him, the marriage takes place. The man is looked on in the family as a *khanu damad* (or son-in-law), and is treated kindly."[3] Among the Mikirs of Assam the mode of marriage "depends upon the wealth and standing of the parties. If the wedding is *ākejoi*—that is, if no payment is to be made for the bride—the girl goes with her husband next day to her new home. Her parents accompany her, and are entertained with food and drink, returning the following day. If the wedding is *ākemèn* (literally ripe, *pakkā*), the lad stays in his father-in-law's house. He rests one day, and then works for his father-in-law for one year, or two years, or even it may be for life, according to agreement. There is no money payment in any case. If the girl is an heiress or only daughter, the

vince of Assam (London, 1855), pp. 82 *sq.*; E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 47. The *jhúms* are the clearings made in the forest and temporarily cultivated. See above, vol. i. pp. 442 *sqq.*

[1] *Census of India, 1891, Assam*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait, vol. i. *Report* (Shillong, 1892), p. 251.

[2] *Census of India, 1891, Assam*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait, vol. i. *Report* (Shillong, 1892), p. 225. Compare R. G. Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology* (London, 1859), i. 103.

[3] [John Butler], *Sketch of Assam* (London, 1847), p. 142.

marriage is usually *ākemèn*, but in the great majority of cases it is *ākejoi*."[1]

Serving for a wife among the Nagas and Turungs of Assam and the Tipperahs and Mrus of Chittagong.

Among the wild tribes of the Naga Hills in Assam, when a young man takes a fancy to a girl either of his own or of a neighbouring village, he must serve in her parents' house for a certain time, varying from one to two or more years, according to agreement, before he may marry her.[2] According to another account a price is paid for a Naga bride, and it is only when a suitor cannot pay it that he is reduced to serving his father-in-law for the maiden; at the end of his period of servitude the young man is provided for and set up in the world by the damsel's father.[3] Among the Turungs of Assam the usual form of marriage is by purchase, and the price of a wife ranges from 40 to 80 rupees. But marriage by servitude is also not uncommon; the time during which the bridegroom has to work in the bride's house varies from three to four years.[4] Among the Tipperahs, a tribe inhabiting the Hill Tracts of Chittagong, when a match is made with the consent of the parents, the young man must serve three years in his father-in-law's house before he obtains his wife or is formally married. But during his time of servitude or probation the girl is really, though not nominally, his wife.[5] Similarly among the Mrus, another tribe of the same region, a wooer has to serve three years for his wife in his father-in-law's house; but if he be wealthy, he can dispense with this service by paying 200 or 300 rupees down.[6] Here, again, we see that service rendered for a wife to a father-in-law is merely a substitute for payment.

Serving for a wife among the Mishmees of North-Eastern India.

Among the Mishmees, who inhabit the mountains at the extreme north-eastern corner of India, on the border of Burma, "women are priced at from fifty to five hundred

[1] Sir Charles Lyall, *The Mikirs*, from the papers of the late Edward Stack (London, 1908), pp. 18 *sq.*

[2] Lieut.-Col. R. G. Woodthorpe, "Notes on the Wild Tribes inhabiting the so-called Naga Hills, on our North-East frontier of India," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xi. (1882) p. 204.

[3] E. T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, p. 41.

[4] *Census of India, 1891, Assam*, by (Sir) E. A. Gait, vol. i. *Report* (Shillong, 1892), p. 284.

[5] Capt. T. H. Lewin, *Wild Races of South-Eastern India* (London, 1870), p. 202.

[6] Capt. T. H. Lewin, *op. cit.* p. 234.

heads, and a large family of daughters are very valuable, especially if they be well-favoured."[1] But "poor younger sons have to work very hard for a wife, for they get no help from their father, but have to trade sometimes for years before they can bring their wives home to a house of their own; but on payment of a part of the purchase-money the youth may marry and visit his wife at her father's house, though she and her children can never leave it until every head is paid. This custom is a great stimulus to the young men in their musk-hunting and trading excursions, for until they pay for their wives they hold no position, and their wives and children have to work for the benefit of the wife's family."[2] In this case, apparently, the husband only visits his wife occasionally at her father's house, and he does not serve his father-in-law directly; but he works in order to earn the money which will enable him to buy his wife and children. The economic principle is therefore the same as in the other cases which we are considering; in all of them a wife and her children are treated practically as valuable pieces of property which a man cannot procure without giving an equivalent for them, whether in kind, or in labour, or in payment of some sort. The "heads" which the Mishmees give in exchange for a wife are, properly speaking, the heads of slain animals, such as buffaloes, bears, tigers, deer, and so forth, which are hung up in the houses and form a kind of currency, being exchanged for slaves and other valuables. But the word "head" in the Mishmee tongue is also used in a more general sense as equivalent to "money."[3]

Serving for a wife in Burma and Siam.

In Burma "after marriage the couple almost always live for two or three years in the house of the bride's parents, the son-in-law becoming one of the family and contributing to its support. Setting up a separate establishment, even in Rangoon, where the young husband is a clerk in an English office, is looked upon with disfavour as a piece of pride and ostentation. If the girl is an only daughter she and her husband stay on till the old people die."[4] Similarly among

[1] T. T. Cooper, *The Mishmee Hills, an Account of a Journey made in an attempt to penetrate Thibet from Assam* (London, 1873), p. 235.

[2] T. T. Cooper, *op. cit.* pp. 236 *sq.*

[3] T. T. Cooper, *op. cit.* pp. 189 *sq.*

[4] Shway Yoe [Sir J. George Scott], *The Burman, his Life and Notions*

the Karens of Burma a young man usually lives with his wife's parents for two or three years after marriage.[1] In Siam a house is built for a newly wedded pair near the house of the wife's parents; hence a young married man is hardly ever to be found living with his own father, but generally with his father-in-law and in a state of dependence on him. But from the birth of their first child the young people are allowed to shift for themselves.[2] So in the Siamese province of Laos and in Cambodia a newly married pair generally resides for some time with the wife's parents and under their tutelage; the husband cannot take his wife away without their consent.[3] In Cambodia the residence may last for years or even for life, and a popular tale is told to account for the origin of the custom.[4]

Serving for a wife among the aboriginal races of Indo-China.

Similar customs are observed by various aboriginal races of Indo-China. Among the Hka Muks, Hka Mets, and Hka Kwens, three forest tribes on the borders of Burma, who are believed to be aborigines, a young man has to serve in the house of his wife's parents for a longer or shorter time.[5] Again, "amongst the Moïs marriage should perhaps be regarded as a mitigated form of slavery. In fact, a daughter who marries does not quit her parents; on the contrary, it is the husband who comes to dwell in his wife's house, unless he is rich enough to furnish a male slave by way of compensation to replace her. But it is to be understood that in no case does this species of slavery permit of the sale of the man who accepts it. Hence the number of his daughters is for the Moï a real source of wealth."[6] So among the Stiengs "daughters above all constitute the honour

(London, 1882), i. 70. Compare Sangermano, *Description of the Burmese Empire* (Rangoon, 1885), p. 133; Capt. C. J. F. S. Forbes, *British Burma* (London, 1878), p. 62.

[1] Rev. F. Mason, D.D., "Physical Character of the Karens," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1866, Part ii. No. 1, p. 18.

[2] Carl Bock, *Temples and Elephants* (London, 1884), pp. 183, 186. Compare De la Loubere, *Du royaume de Siam* (Amsterdam, 1691), i. 156 *sq.*

[3] E. Aymonier, *Notes sur le Laos* (Saigon, 1885), p. 186; J. Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge* (Paris, 1883), i. 409.

[4] E. Aymonier, *Notice sur le Cambodge* (Paris, 1875), p. 54.

[5] (Sir) J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, Part i. vol. i. (Rangoon, 1900) p. 522.

[6] A. Gautier, "Voyage au pays des Moïs," *Cochinchine Française, Excursions et Reconnaissances*, No. 14 (Saigon, 1882), p. 246.

and the riches of a house, for to the mind of a Stieng the daughter seems nobler than the son, because at her marriage the nubile daughter rarely quits the paternal home; it is the son-in-law who, obliged to submit to a sort of mitigated slavery, takes up his abode with his father-in-law and thus increases the household and the number of hands available for work in the rice-fields. In consequence of this custom, which has the force of law, a young man, who would take his betrothed bride to his own home, is bound to give his father-in-law a strong healthy male slave. That is, among the Stiengs, the dowry which in such a case the young man must provide; only the dowry does not accompany the young wife to her new home, it replaces her in the house of her father."[1] Here, again, the economic value of the husband's services is brought out in the clearest way by the stipulation, that if he deprives his father-in-law of them, he must provide a sturdy male slave as a substitute.

Serving for a wife in Sumatra.

The practice of serving for a wife instead of paying for her is found in some parts of the Indian Archipelago. Thus in Lampong, the district at the southern extremity of Sumatra, when a man cannot pay the bride price, he is obliged to live with his parents-in-law and work for them until he has discharged his debt. Sometimes the period during which he is to reside with them and work for them is stipulated beforehand; it is usually seven years. The husband's labour is reckoned towards the payment of the bride price. In Palembang, another district in the south of Sumatra, the custom is similar. A poor suitor binds himself to live with his parents-in-law and to labour for them until he has paid for his wife. Sometimes it happens that he is unable all his life long to discharge the debt; in that case the debt is transmitted to his children, who continue like their father in a state of bondage until the daughters, by the bride prices which are paid for them at their marriage, at length succeed in paying the sum which is still owing for the marriage of their mother.[2] Similarly among the Gayos, a people who inhabit an inland

[1] Le Père Azémar (Missionnaire apostolique), "Les Stiengs de Brolam," *Cochinchine Française, Excursions et Reconnaissances*, No. 28 (Saigon, 1886), pp. 220 *sq.*

[2] G. A. Wilken, "Over het huwelijks-en erfrecht bij de volken van Zuid-Sumatra," *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), ii. 232 *sq.*

district of Achin, in the north of Sumatra, if a man cannot pay for his wife, he works for her family until he is able to discharge his debt, when he is free to remove her to his own house. His period of servitude may last for years. Indeed the girl's father will sometimes not consent to such a marriage unless his son-in-law binds himself not to pay the full bride price before a certain time. So long as the price is not paid, the children belong to the clan of the father-in-law, but as soon as it is settled in full, they pass into the clan of their father.[1] Again, among the Looboos, a primitive tribe of Mandailing in Sumatra, a man is obliged to serve his prospective parents-in-law for two years before marriage, during which he has to perform all kinds of drudgery for them. Even after his marriage, the custom of the country imposes on him many obligations as to field labour for the benefit of his wife's father and mother.[2]

Another form of marriage by service in Sumatra.

In another form of marriage, which is practised in Sumatra and bears the name of *ambel anak*, a man transfers himself permanently to the house of his father-in-law, where he lives in a state between that of a son and a debtor, partaking of what the house affords, but himself entirely destitute of property. His own family renounce all right to, or interest in, him; should he rob or murder, his wife's family pay the fine, and if he is murdered, it is his wife's family who receive the blood-wit. They, too, are responsible for all debts that he may contract after marriage. Further, they are free to divorce him at any time and to send him away; in that case he departs empty-handed as he came, leaving his children behind him. Sometimes his wife's family indulge him so far as to let him remove with his wife to a house of his own, but he, his children, and his goods, are still their property. Nevertheless, if he has not daughters by his marriage, he may redeem himself and his wife on paying her bride price (*jujur*); but if there are daughters, the difficulty of emancipation is enhanced, because his wife's family are entitled to compensation for them also. However, on payment of an additional fine he may insist on his release, whilst his

[1] C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Het Gajōland en zijne Bewoners* (Batavia, 1903), pp. 270 *sq.*

[2] J. Kreemer, "De Loeboes in Mandailing," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxvi. (1912) p. 321.

daughters are not marriageable.[1] This form of marriage is recognized by the Bataks or Battas of Central Sumatra, though it is much less frequent among them than marriage by purchase, which confers on the husband full rights over the wife whose price he has paid.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes.

A similar form of marriage is usually observed by the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes. Among them a married man regularly lives with his wife's parents, who lodge him and feed him. In return he has to work for them in the rice-fields and elsewhere. Only after the lapse of two, three, or four years, when the wife has become a mother, may the young couple lay out a rice-field of their own. In rare instances the wife is allowed, some years after marriage, to follow her husband to his own village, but she may never do so in her mother's lifetime, unless the mother accompanies her. And if the husband falls sick while he is living with his wife's family, he is permitted to return to his own people, and in that case his wife often goes with him to nurse him in his sickness; but such a stay in her husband's family is only temporary. During his residence with his wife's people a man is bound to behave respectfully, not only to her parents, but also to her brothers and sisters and more distant members of the family. He must address them all with the polite *komi* ("ye") instead of with the familiar *siko* ("you"); and he may never mention the names of his wife's parents, uncles, and aunts. If their names happen to be those of common objects, he may not call these objects by their common names, but must substitute other words or phrases for them; for example, if his father-in-law bears a name which in the native tongue means "horse," then his son-in-law may not call a horse a horse, but must allude to it delicately in the phrase, "some one with a long face." When the Toradjas are asked why they treat their wives' parents with such punctilious respect, they say that it is from fear lest their parents-in-law should dissolve the marriage. But though a man usually lives with his wife's family and works

[1] W. Marsden, *History of Sumatra* (London, 1811), pp. 262 *sq.* Compare A. L. van Hasselt, *Volksbeschrijving van Midden Sumatra* (Leyden, 1882), pp. 291 *sq.*

[2] Franz Junghuhn, *Die Battaländer auf Sumatra* (Berlin, 1847), ii. 131 *sq.*

for them, he has nevertheless to pay a price for her, or rather his blood relations have to do so for him. The price is generally not paid at marriage but some time afterwards. When a child has been born of the marriage, the payment of the bride price should no longer be delayed. The primary object of the payment is said to be "to make the eyes of the children hard," that is to prevent them from being ashamed. For if the bride price is not paid, the child has no father, and the father has no rights over the child, who in that case belongs to his mother alone.[1] Thus it would seem that among the Toradjas the bride price is really paid for the children, not for the wife; a man earns his wife by serving her parents, he earns his children by paying for them. Both acquisitions are made on a business footing; in each case the transaction is strictly commercial; neither wife nor child may be had by him who is not prepared to give a full equivalent for them either in labour or in goods. Similarly in some African tribes the bride price paid at marriage appears to be intended to buy the children who are to be born rather than the wife who is to bear them. Hence in these tribes, if a man pays nothing for his wife, his children do not belong to him but to his wife's father or maternal uncle, and he can only obtain possession of his own offspring by paying for them.[2]

The bride price paid for the children rather than for the wife.

Among the natives of South-Eastern Celebes, when a

Serving for a wife in South-Eastern Celebes.

[1] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), ii. 23 *sqq.*, 27 *sqq.*

[2] For example, among the Banyoro of Central Africa, "when a poor man is unable to procure the cattle required for his marriage at once, he may, by agreement with the bride's father, pay them by instalments; the children, however, born in the meantime belong to the wife's father, and each of them must be redeemed with a cow." See *Emin Pasha in Central Africa* (London 1888), p. 86. Again, the Matabele "do not buy the wife from her father, but after the first child is born the husband has to pay its value, or else the wife's father has the right to take the child away." See Lionel Decle, *Three Years in Savage Africa* (London, 1898), p. 158. Again, among the Bambala of the Congo valley, "the position of the children of a marriage varies according as the mother has been purchased or betrothed. In the latter case they belong to the maternal uncle, and the purchase price of the girls goes to him. The children of the purchased wife, on the other hand, belong to the father." See E. Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds* (London, 1913), p. 95. Again, among the Bakundu of the Cameroons, if a man marries a woman without paying for her, the children of the marriage belong to the wife's father. See Missionar Bufe (Kamerun), "Die Bakundu," *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.F. xii. (1913) p. 236.

young man desires to marry, his father goes to the parents of the girl on whom his son has set his heart, and says, "My son would like to come and help you with the house-work and the field-work; but you must not be angry with him if he does not work well." Should the implied offer of marriage be favourably received, the young man goes to live with the damsel's parents, and if after a period of probation they are satisfied with him, and the girl returns his affection, he marries her, but he must pay for her hand a price which varies from fifty to a hundred guilders. After the marriage he continues to reside for some time, generally a year, in the house of his wife's parents. Not till later does he take his wife away to a place of his own.[1]

Serving for a wife among the Tenggeres of Java.

Among the Tenggeres, who inhabit a mountainous region in the east of Java, men seldom marry outside their own village, and no price is paid for a wife; but after marriage the young couple take up their abode in the house of the wife's father, whom the husband now regards as his own father, being bound to obey him and to help him in his work. If there are several daughters in the family, all the sons-in-law reside with their children in the house of their father-in-law, until one of them, generally the eldest, has become rich enough to build a house for himself. When only one son-in-law is left in the house, he must remain with his wife's parents until either a new son-in-law takes his place or the parents are dead; in the latter case the whole inheritance falls to him. However, when there are many sons-in-law with their children and none of them is well enough off to make a home of his own, indigence reigns in the house by reason of the many mouths that there are to feed; and in that case one of the sons-in-law is permitted to remove to the home of his own father, if his father is wealthier or has a larger house.[2] However, a form of marriage under which a man is permanently transferred to his wife's family, with only the possibility,

[1] F. Treffers, "Het landschap Laiwoei in Z. O. Celebes," *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, xxxi. (Leyden, 1914) pp. 209 *sq.*

[2] J. H. F. Kohlbrugge, "Die Tĕnggĕresen, ein alter Javanische Volksstaam," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie*, liii. (1901) p. 116.

under certain conditions, of ultimately returning to his own family, is to be distinguished from the form of marriage under which a man serves his father-in-law for a limited time for the wife whom he will afterwards regularly take away with him to his own home.

Serving for a wife among the Kayans of Borneo.

Among all the Kayans or Bahaus of Central Borneo a young husband usually goes at first to reside in the house of his parents-in-law, and only after three or four years may he remove with his wife to a house of his own or to his parents' house. However, if the wife is delivered of a child in her parents' house, she may follow her husband to his home before the expiry of this period. A breach of the custom is permitted only on the payment of a very heavy fine. An exception to the rule is made when an only son marries a girl who is one of a large family; for in that case the parents often agree to let the bride accompany the bridegroom at once to his own house.[1]

Serving for a wife in Amboyna, Ceram, Ceramlaut, and the Watubela Islands.

The custom of serving for a wife is observed in other parts of the Indian Archipelago. Thus in Amboyna, when two young people have been publicly betrothed, the young man settles in the house of his future parents-in-law and cohabits secretly with their daughter, as if she really were his wife. During this time he must help his wife's parents in their daily work and bring them a part of his earnings. This state of things may last for years, and the children born in the course of it to the young pair follow their mother or remain in her family.[2] Similarly in Ceram, when a young man is betrothed, he takes up his abode in the house of his future parents-in-law, is treated as one of the family, and may cohabit freely with their daughter, though the couple are not yet married. The marriage does not take place for some time, and it may not be celebrated till the young husband has paid the full price for his wife. In some villages of Ceram the custom is that all children born before the payment of the bride price remain with the

[1] A. W. Nieuwenhuis, *Quer durch Borneo* (Leyden, 1904–1907), i. 85. The practice in regard to the residence of young married couples seems to vary a good deal among the tribes of Borneo. See H. Ling Roth, *The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo* (London, 1896), i. 124 *sq.*

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tussehen Selebes en Papua* (The Hague, 1886), pp. 67 *sq.*

wife's parents. Men in indigent circumstances are allowed to pay for their wives by service, and sometimes it is agreed that some of the children born to a poor man shall be accepted by his parents-in-law instead of a bride price or of part of it.[1] In Ceramlaut the custom is similar. On his betrothal a young man goes to live with his future parents-in-law, and he is bound to help them and to give his betrothed a part of his earnings. If he cannot pay the bride price, his children belong to their mother's family.[2] In the Watubela Islands marriage is contracted in one of two ways. Either a man pays for his wife and takes her to live with him in his parents' house; or without paying anything he goes to live in her parents' house and works for them and for her. In the latter case the children whom he begets belong not to him but to their mother; should he afterwards, however, pay the bride price, the children belong to him and he has the same rights over them which he would have acquired by paying for his wife at the beginning.[3]

Serving for a wife among the Tagales and other tribes of the Philippine Islands.

Among the Tagales of the Philippine Islands it was formerly the custom for a young man to take up his abode in the house of his future wife's family; there he laboured like a bondsman for his father-in-law for three or four years, at the end of which he received the girl to wife, and his family provided him with a hut and clothes.[4] Among the Bisayas, of the Samar and Leyte islands, in the Philippines, "the suitor has to serve in the house of the bride's parents two, three, and even five years, before he takes his bride home; and money cannot purchase exemption from this onerous restriction. He boards in the house of the bride's parents, who furnish the rice, but he has to supply the vegetables himself. At the expiration of his term of service he builds, with the assistance of his relations and friends, the house for the family which is about to be newly established."[5] Among the Bagobos of Mindanao a man generally does not

[1] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.* pp. 131 *sq.*

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.* pp. 171, 173.

[3] J. G. F. Riedel, *op. cit.* pp. 205 *sq.*

[4] Ferd. Blumentritt, *Versuch einer Ethnographie der Philippinen* (Gotha, 1882), p. 14 (*Petermann's Mittheilungen, Ergänzungsheft*, No. 67).

[5] F. Jagor, *Travels in the Philippines* (London, 1875), p. 296.

marry his wife for a year or more after the marriage settlement has been concluded, and in the interval he serves his future father-in-law. Even after marriage, when the young couple are established in their new home, the bride's family will exact a certain amount of service from the bridegroom for several years.[1] With the Kulamans, another tribe of Mindanao, it is customary for a youth to serve his future father-in-law for two or three years before marriage, but once he receives his wife he is released from service.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Kamchadales.

The custom of serving for a wife is practised also by some tribes of Northern Asia. Thus, for example, "when a Kamchadale decides to marry, he looks about in a neighbouring village, seldom in his own, for a bride, and when he has found one to his mind, he discloses his intention to her parents and offers to serve them for a time. The permission is readily granted, and during his service he endeavours, with uncommon diligence, to satisfy his new masters, so far as lies in his power. When his period of service has expired, he requests leave to carry away his bride, and if he has earned the approbation of the parents, of the bride, and of her relations, the leave is granted him at once; but if he has incurred their displeasure, he receives a small compensation for his services and is sent empty away. It sometimes happens that such suitors hire themselves out in a village where they are complete strangers, without giving the least intimation of their intentions, and though everybody can at once guess what they have come for, the people pretend to know nothing about it, till the suitor or one of his friends announces his purpose." Immediately after the consummation of the marriage, the husband takes his wife away to his own house, but after some time the young couple return to the house of his wife's father, and there celebrate a wedding feast.[3] However, according to other accounts, even after a Kamchadale had earned his bride by serving her father for a period of time varying from one to four years, he was not free to depart with his wife, but must take up his abode permanently with his wife's father;

[1] Fay-Cooper Cole, *The Wild Tribes of Davao District, Mindanao* (Chicago, 1913), pp. 101 *sq.* (*Field Museum of Natural History, Publication 170*).

[2] Fay-Cooper Cole, *op. cit.* p. 157.

[3] S. Krascheninnikow, *Beschreibung des Landes Kamtschatka* (Lemgo, 1766), pp. 256 *sq.*

and if his wife died, and her parents liked him, they would give him another daughter to wife, without requiring him to serve for her.[1]

Serving for a wife among the Koryaks.

In like manner among the Koryaks, the neighbours of the Kamchadales on the north, a suitor brings presents to the man whose daughter he wishes to marry, and if his presents are accepted he takes service with his future father-in-law. In this service, which may last three, five, or even ten years, the hardest tasks are laid on him, such as fetching wood and tending the reindeer. If he succeeds in pleasing his taskmaster, he gets the girl to wife as the reward of his long and incessant labours; but if he fails to win the favour of the damsel's father, he is sent about his business, and all his pains are wasted.[2] Generally, when a husband has at last won his wife, he takes her away to live with him in his parents' house, but sometimes he settles permanently in the house of his wife's father; this happens particularly when there are no sons in his wife's family, for in that case his father-in-law may ask him to stay with him altogether and take the place of a son. In modern times the period of serving for a bride would seem to be reduced, for we are told that it lasts from six months to three years, and that its termination depends on the pleasure of the bride's father or elder brother. Often the girl's mother will say to the father or, in his absence, to the elder son, that the young man has been tortured long enough.[3]

Serving for a wife among the Chukchee.

Among the Chukchee, who inhabit the north-eastern extremity of Siberia, "the usual method of getting a bride is the so-called *naund-ó urgin* (literally 'for wife herdsman being'; *i.e.*, the custom of serving as a herdsman of the future father-in-law, in payment for the bride). This institution, as its name indicates, evidently originated under the conditions of nomadic life, and the necessity of having

[1] G. W. Steller, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka* (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1774), pp. 343-346; Peter Dobell, *Travels in Kamtchatka and Siberia* (London, 1830), i. 82.

[2] S. Krascheninnikow, *Beschreibung des Landes Kamtschatka*, p. 281; T. de Pauly, *Description Ethnographique des Peuples de la Russie* (St. Petersburg, 1862), "Peuples de la Sibérie Orientale," p. 10.

[3] W. Jochelson, *The Koryak* (Leyden and New York, 1908), pp. 739-744 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History, New York*, vol. vi.).

young men care for the reindeer-herd. It reminds us of Laban, whose herd Jacob tended for years, first for Leah, and then for Rachel. The term applied to this custom is so firmly established that it is used also even among the Maritime Chukchee, though they have no herds, and the bridegroom simply lives in the house of the girl's father and works for him during a certain period. Among the Reindeer Chukchee the term has acquired a broader meaning, and is applied to all marriages in which the young man obtains his bride, not through his family connections, but exclusively through his own efforts."

Hard lot of a Chukchee wooer.

Generally, a young Chukchee announces his suit by bringing a heavy load of fuel from the woods to the man whose daughter he intends to court. "Then begins his trial, which lasts one summer, two or even three summers. All this time the suitor leads a very hard life. He rises first in the morning, and retires last at night. Often he is not even given a place in the sleeping-room, but stays in the outer tent or in the open air. Most of his time is spent with the herd. He carries burdens, hauls heavily-loaded sledges, mends and repairs broken utensils. He has to please the girl's father, her elder brothers, and other male members of the family. If one of the old people reproaches him and calls him names, he has to bear it patiently, and is even expected to agree. When the old people are ill-tempered,—as many Chukchee are,—they may decline food and shelter to the poor suitor. Then he has to endure the pangs of hunger and cold while performing his work. If the girl likes him, she will try to give him some meat; or he may steal some food and devour it in haste, lest somebody should see it and report him to the father. Even then, after two or three months of continual toil, he may be driven away without any apparent reason. 'This is no cause of resentment,' I was told by the Chukchee, 'but only a weakling consents to go. A good strong man remains and works on without food, without place in the sleeping-room, and even without hope.' To desist, and return home without a bride, is considered a humiliation for a young man. His father will say, 'So you are really bad. If you were good, you would not be sent away thus.'

"After the first few months the father of the bride usually somewhat relents, and the conditions of life of the suitor become less severe. From that time on, it is not thought becoming to send him away without serious reason. The suitor also begins to insist on his matrimonial rights. Often he acquires them after several months of struggle. Of course, this depends largely upon the woman herself. Some fathers, however, keep guard over their daughters. . . .

A Chukchee son-in-law receives part of his father-in-law's herd of reindeer.

"As soon as the bridegroom becomes the actual husband, his thoughts naturally turn back to his own home and herd, and he plans to take his wife home. For this reason the girl's father delays the marriage as long as possible, especially when he is rather short of herdsmen and the help of the bridegroom is of much value to him. In some tales, 'the bridegroom who came from afar,' usually after having overcome all the obstacles put in his way, stays for a long time with his wife's family; and only after several years, when the couple have children, does he begin to think about returning to his own country. At this time his father-in-law usually gives him a part of his herd, and assists in taking him back to his own country. Even now, the Chukchee consider it proper for the young husband to stay with his father-in-law two or three years, 'as long as his joy in his wife is still fresh.' The inconsiderate young man stays with his father-in-law half a year, and then leaves him. He will stay longer only if the father-in-law has a large herd and there is any likelihood of his succeeding to part of it.

"When the son-in-law takes his wife home without quarrelling with her father, he is usually given some reindeer, the number of which depends partly upon the quality of work the young man has done while serving for his bride. The better his service, the larger the reward he receives from his father-in-law. The woman also will take a few reindeer, which from her childhood on were marked for her with her own private ear-mark. I was told that a rich reindeer-breeder sometimes gives to his son-in-law the 'freedom of one day'; *i.e.*, during this one day the young man may catch reindeer from the herd and put his mark on their ears. All these become his property.

"When a rich man wants to marry a girl of a poor

Time of service for a wife shortened for a rich man among the Chukchee.

family, the time of service is much shortened, and even dwindles down to nothing. Especially a second wife is rarely acquired through service in her family; for the man who has a wife and children, and who is often of middle age, will find it difficult to leave his own herd and home, and undertake service for a second wife—a custom suited only to young suitors. If he is rich, he arranges the marriage with the girl's father in an easier way. According to Chukchee ideas, however, it is improper to pay for a bride 'as if she were a reindeer.' The Chukchee always criticise the Tungus and Yakut, who ask and receive pay for their brides in reindeer, skins, and money. Rich reindeer-breeders arrange the terms of a marriage with the girl's father in a more decent form. The suitor gives to the girl's father a few reindeer, but he does not call them pay for the bride, but a 'joyful gift,' meaning the joy it gives him to marry the young girl; or more frequently he invites the poor family of his new wife to come to his camp and to live there on his own herd. If they do not want to live in his camp, because of the possibility of quarrels with the first wife, they may stay close by, and from time to time receive from him presents of live or slaughtered reindeer. Still I know of rich men of middle age who had families, and who served for several months in the families of young girls whom they wanted to marry, undergoing all the usual hardships of the bridegroom's life."[1]

Parallel between a Chukchee wooing and that of Jacob.

The hardships which a Chukchee wooer undergoes in tending the reindeer of his future father-in-law remind us of the hardships which Jacob suffered in tending the flocks of Laban; "in the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night; and my sleep fled from mine eyes."[2] And the reindeer which a Chukchee receives from his father-in-law when, after years of hard service, he departs with his wife and children to his own land, remind us of the flocks which Jacob received from Laban, and which he carried off with him when he, in like manner, returned with his wives and children to his own home.[3] So similar may life be under

[1] Waldemar Bogoras, *The Chuckchee* (Leyden and New York, 1904–1909), pp. 579, 584-586 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History, New York*, vol. vii.).

[2] Genesis xxxi. 40.

[3] Genesis xxx. 25 *sqq.*, xxxi. 17 *sqq.*

circumstances outwardly so different; for few contrasts can be greater than that between the bleak steppes and icy seas of Chukchee-land and the green pastures and sunny skies of Syria.

Serving for a wife among the Yukaghirs and Barabinzes of Siberia.

Another Siberian people who retain the custom of serving for a wife are the Yukaghirs. Among them, when a young man wishes to marry a girl, he begins by working voluntarily for her family. For example, he will bring them the produce of his hunt, chop wood for them, mend the sledge or the gun of his prospective father-in-law, bind up his nets for him, and so forth. These attentions are services for the bride; they last for a longer or shorter time according to circumstances. If the suitor is accepted, the marriage is consummated, and the bridegroom takes up his residence in his father-in-law's house, where he occupies a very subordinate position. "In fact, he appears to be 'serving' for his wife as long as any members of the family older than her are alive. He has to do the bidding of his father-in-law, his wife's elder brothers, and other elder members of the family; but after the death of his father-in-law, his wife's uncle, and her elder brothers, or after the latter marry and go away to live with their fathers-in-law, he himself becomes the head of the family." On the other hand, his attitude to the younger members of his wife's family is not at all that of a subordinate; on the contrary, under certain circumstances, he assumes paternal authority over them. Thus with the Yukaghirs the rule is that a man makes his permanent home in the house of his father-in-law. But there are exceptions to the rule. For example, two families may agree to exchange daughters, and then the sons remain in their respective homes; and sometimes a man will allow his son-in-law to go and live with his parents, if these have no other children and he himself has offspring. When the husband has had children born to him, he may take his wife and children and depart; but public opinion blames a man who thus deserts his father-in-law. Again, among the Yukaghirs of the *tundra* or steppe, it is customary for a man, after serving from one to three years in his father-in-law's house, to carry off his wife to his own home; but before he does so, he must pay a certain number of reindeer

for her. These customs of purchasing a bride and taking her away from the house of her parents are said to have been borrowed from the Tungus by the Yukaghirs of the steppe. Their practice thus exhibits a combination of service and payment for a wife; a suitor must work for his bride as well as pay for her.[1] The Barabinzes, a Tartar people of Western Siberia, between the Obi and the Irtish Rivers, buy their wives for sums varying from two to fifty rubels; but many of them, instead of paying for their brides, give their services in fishing, hunting, and agriculture to their fathers-in-law as an equivalent for the bride price (*kalym*).[2]

Serving for a wife among the Eskimo and Indians of America.

In America the custom of serving for a wife is found both among Eskimos and Indians. Thus among the Kenai, an Eskimo people of Alaska, a man must perform a year's service for his bride. He goes to the house of his intended father-in-law, and there, without speaking a word, proceeds to bring water, to prepare food, and to heat the bath-room. Questioned as to his intentions, he explains that he desires the daughter of the house to wife. At the end of a year's service he is free to take his wife home with him.[3] Again, among the Naudowessies, an Indian tribe in the region of the Great Lakes, it was customary for a young man to reside for a year as a menial servant in the tent of the Indian whose daughter he wished to marry; during that time he hunted and brought all the game he killed to the family of his future wife, and when the year expired the marriage was celebrated. But this servitude was only undergone by a man in his youth for his first wife; it was not repeated for any other woman whom he might afterwards marry.[4] Among the Indians of Yucatan a man used to serve his father-in-law four or five years for his wife; if he failed to complete his term of service, he was turned

[1] Waldemar Jochelson, *The Yukaghir and the Yukaghirized Tungus* (Leyden and New York, 1910), pp. 87 *sq.*, 91-93 (*The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Memoir of the American Museum of Natural History, New York*, vol. ix. Part i.).

[2] J. G. Georgi, *Beschreibung aller Nationen des Russischen Reichs* (St. Petersburg, 1776), pp. 188, 195.

[3] H. H. Bancroft, *The Native Races of the Pacific States* (London, 1875–1876), i. 134; T. de Pauly, *Description Ethnographique des Peuples de la Russie* (St. Petersburg, 1862), "Peuples de l'Amérique Russe," p. 10.

[4] J. Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, Third Edition (London, 1781), p. 373.

adrift and the woman given to another.[1] Among the Arawaks of British Guiana "the wife's father expects the bridegroom to work for him in clearing the forest, and in other things, and the young couple often remain with him until an increasing family renders a separate establishment necessary."[2] However, it would seem that among the Indians of Guiana, even when a man has earned his wife by service, he does not remove her from the house, or at least the vicinity, of her father, but that on the contrary he goes to live permanently with her people. On this subject Sir Everard F. Im Thurn writes as follows: "The nature of the bargain for a wife is another obscure point. It is certainly sometimes, if not always, by purchase from the parents. . . . Sometimes, again, a girl is given by her parents to a man in recompense for some service done. The marriage once arranged, the husband immediately transports his possessions to the house of his father-in-law, and there he lives and works. The head of his family, for whom he is bound to work, and whom he obeys, is not his own father, but his wife's. A complete and final separation between husband and wife may be made at the will of the former at any time before the birth of children; after that, if the husband goes away, as very rarely happens, it is considered not lawful separation, but desertion. When the family of the young couple become too large to be conveniently housed underneath the roof of the father-in-law, the young husband builds a house for himself by the side of that of his wife's father; and to this habit is probably due the formation of settlements."[3]

Serving for a wife among the Indians of Brazil.

Among the Indians of Brazil, besides the method of violence, "the savage acquires his wife with the express consent of her father in two different ways; first, by work in the house of the father-in-law (this takes place especially among the larger, settled hordes and tribes), and, second, by purchase. The young man devotes himself, like Jacob

[1] A. de Herrera, *The General History of the Vast Continent and Islands of America, commonly called the West Indies*, translated by Captain John Stevens (London, 1725–1726), iv. 172.

[2] Rev. W. H. Brett, *The Indian Tribes of Guiana* (London, 1868), p. 101.

[3] (Sir) Everard F. Im Thurn, *Among the Indians of Guiana* (London, 1883), pp. 221 *sq.*

with Laban, often for several years, to services and work of all kinds in the house of his prospective father-in-law, labouring with indefatigable diligence. He goes out hunting and fishing for his father-in-law; he helps him to build the hut, to clear the forest, to carry wood, to make canoes, to fashion weapons, to twine nets, and so on. It is true that he generally lives with his own relations, but he spends the whole day in his sweetheart's house. There several suitors often meet. Among the small tribes on the Amazon he is during this time allowed the so-called 'bosom privilege,' as is often the case among Siberian peoples; in other tribes stricter principles prevail, and the father would punish with death any attempt on the virginity of his daughter. If the lover is at last fortunate enough to obtain the consent of the father, he at first takes a place and a hearth in the hut of his parents-in-law, or he at once occupies a hut of his own, apart from the parents. Among the Guaycurus the son-in-law remains always in the house of his parents-in-law, but from thenceforth they abstain from speaking with him. Sometimes the wooer hires himself to the family of a strange horde, or even of a strange tribe, and after marriage he generally remains among them. That is one cause of the common mixture of languages."[1]

Serving for a wife in Africa, on the Gold Coast, in Southern Nigeria, and the French Sudan.

The custom of serving for a wife is occasionally reported from Africa, but it appears to be comparatively rare among the tribes of that continent. Thus amongst the Tshi-speaking people of the Gold Coast, the usual way of obtaining a wife is to buy her from her relations by the payment of a sum which varies, in English money, from eighteen shillings to seven pounds five shillings. But when a man is too poor to scrape together even the smallest of these sums, he will live with his wife without paying anything for her, unless it be a bottle or two of rum; but in that case he generally resides with his wife's family and gives them his services towards their common support.[2] Again, among the Ekoi of Southern Nigeria a man who has set his affections on a particular woman and desires to marry her, must serve her

[1] C. F. Ph. v. Martius, *Zur Ethnographie Amerika's, zumal Brasiliens* (Leipsic, 1867), pp. 107 *sq.*

[2] (Sir) A. B. Ellis, *The Tshi-speaking Peoples of the Gold Coast of West Africa* (London, 1887), p. 281.

family for some considerable time, usually from two to three years. His work mostly consists in helping to clear the bush for the next season's farms, but other services may be required of him, and during his time of service he is expected to make presents to the relations of his future wife. After marriage the wife becomes a member of her husband's family, and goes to live in his dwelling.[1] Among the Zangas of the French Sudan a man does not pay for his wife, but he works instead once a year for three years on the fields of his father-in-law, or rather of the head of the family group to which his father-in-law belongs.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Boobies of Fernando Po.

Among the Boobies or Edeeyahs of Fernando Po "the system of betrothal observed among Eastern nations here obtains in the case of the first wife. It must continue at least for two years, during which time the aspirant to Edeeyah beauty is obliged to perform such labour as would otherwise fall to the lot of his intended wife; carrying the palm-oil to the market, water for household purposes, planting yams, etc., thus realizing in part, Jacob's servitude for his loved Rachel, 'And they seemed but a few days for the love he had to her.' The girl is kept in a hut concealed from the public gaze as much as possible. The courtship or betrothal commences at thirteen or fourteen years of age, but connexion is not permitted until the conclusion of the two years, and should frail nature yield before the specified time, the offence is treated as seduction, the youth severely punished, as well as heavy fines exacted from his relatives; indeed to seduce an Edeeyah is one of the greatest crimes against their social system. The period of betrothal having expired, the girl is still detained in the hut until there are unequivocal symptoms of her becoming a parent, which failing, the term is prolonged until eighteen months. On her first appearance in public as a married woman, she is surrounded by all the young maidens of the tribe, who dance and sing round her, and a feast is held by the friends and relatives. The probationary system of betrothal is only observed for

[1] P. Amaury Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush* (London, 1912), pp. 105, 109.

[2] Louis Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), pp. 366 *sq.*

the first wife, who keeps all the others in order, polygamy being universally permitted."[1]

Serving for a wife among the Tumbuka of British Central Africa.

Among the Tumbuka of British Central Africa, when a young man's suit was accepted, he had to go and build a house in the village of his future father-in-law and help him to hoe his garden in the rainy season. When all arrangements were completed, the marriage took place and the husband became a member of his wife's village. Yet there he had to observe a number of taboos. He might not call his wife's parents by their names, nor might he eat with them. Yet he was bound to obey and respect them more strictly than his own father and mother, and if he treated them harshly, he would be driven from the village and compelled to leave his wife and children behind him. Should he desire, after the lapse of some years, to return to his own people, he might do so on condition of presenting a slave or a cow to his parents-in-law to redeem himself. But his children he could never redeem. They might go with him and his wife to his old home, but when they grew up they must return to the village of their maternal grandparents and build houses for themselves there as members of that community.[2]

Serving for a wife among the Banyais of the Zambesi.

Among the Banyais of the Zambesi River, "when a young man takes a liking to a girl of another village, and the parents have no objection to the match, he is obliged to come and live at their village. He has to perform certain services for the mother-in-law, such as keeping her well supplied with firewood; and when he comes into her presence he is obliged to sit with his knees in a bent position, as putting out his feet towards the old lady would give her great offence. If he becomes tired of living in this state of vassalage, and wishes to return to his own family, he is obliged to leave all his children behind—they belong to the wife. This is only a more stringent enforcement of the law from which emanates the practice which prevails so very extensively in Africa, known to Europeans as 'buying wives.' Such virtually it is, but it does not appear quite in that

[1] Captain W. Allen, R.N., and T. R. H. Thomson, M.D., *Narrative of the Expedition sent by Her Majesty's Government to the River Niger in 1841* (London, 1848), ii. 203 *sq.*

[2] Donald Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People* (London, 1914), pp. 153, 155.

light to the actors. So many head of cattle or goats are given to the parents of the girl, 'to give her up,' as it is termed, *i.e.* to forego all claim on her offspring, and allow an entire transference of her and her seed into another family. If nothing is given, the family from which she has come can claim the children as part of itself: the payment is made to sever this bond. In the case supposed, the young man has not been able to advance anything for that purpose."[1] Hence among the Banyais, as among the Toradjas of Celebes,[2] the bride price seems to be paid for the purchase of the children rather than of the wife; the mere begetting of children, in the eyes of these people, apparently gives the father no claim over them; if he desires to own them, he must pay for them as for any other article of property. This implicit denial of the father's vital connexion with his offspring may perhaps date from a time when the mere fact of physical paternity was unknown.

§ 18. *Conclusion*

The tradition of Jacob's marriage conforms to the customs of many races.

The foregoing examples suffice to prove that marriages like that of Jacob have been and still are practised in many different parts of the world. In marrying his cross-cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, in wedding the elder sister before the younger, and in serving his father-in-law for a term of years for each of his wives, the patriarch conformed to customs which are fully recognized and strictly observed by many races. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that they were also recognized and observed by the Semites in the patriarchal age, and that, though they were discarded by later ages, the historian who attributes the observance of them to Jacob had good authority for doing so, whether he described the customs from personal observation or merely from oral tradition. To say this is not to prejudice the vexed question of the historical reality of the Hebrew patriarchs, but it is to affirm that the portraiture of manners in Jacob's biography is no mere fancy picture but drawn from the life.

[1] David Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* (London, 1857), pp. 622 *sq.*

[2] Above, p. 356, with note[2].

CHAPTER VII

JACOB AND THE MANDRAKES

How Reuben found mandrakes and brought them to his mother Leah.

ON a day in May, when the reapers were busy among the wheat,[1] the child Reuben had followed them into the fields, and straying along the hillside, he observed growing on the ground a plant which attracted his attention both by its appearance and its smell. Its great broad leaves, like those of a primrose, but more than twice as large, lay flat on the earth and radiated from a centre, where grew a round yellow fruit about the size of a large plum. The plant emitted a peculiar but not unpleasant odour, which had guided the child to the spot. He plucked the fruit and tasted it, and finding it juicy and sweet, he gathered his lapful of the yellow berries and carried them home to his mother Leah. The fruit was what we call mandrakes, and what the Hebrews called "love-apples" (*dudaim*), apparently because the taste of it was thought to cause barren women to conceive.[2] Now,

[1] Genesis xxx. 14. Throughout Palestine the wheat harvest is at its height at the end of May, except in the highlands of Galilee, where it is about a fortnight later. See H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*[4] (London, 1882), pp. 583 *sq.* Compare I. Benzinger, *Hebraïsche Archäologie*[2] (Tübingen, 1907), p. 141; C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land* (London, 1906), pp. 205 *sq.* The barley harvest is earlier; in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem it is usually in full swing by the end of April or the beginning of May (C. T. Wilson, *op. cit.* p. 205).

[2] As to the plant (*Mandragora officinarum* or *officinalis*), see H. B. Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*[9] (London, 1898), pp. 466-468. Others speak of "the insipid, *sickish* taste" of the fruit (W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, London, 1859, p. 577), and of the "ill savour" of the plant (H. Maundrell, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, Perth, 1800, p. 96, under date March 24th, Old Style). The Hebrew name of the plant (דּוּדָאִים *dudaim*) is derived from דּוֹד *dod*, "beloved," "love." See Fr. Brown, S. R. Driver, and Ch. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1906), pp. 187, 188. That by *dudaim* are meant mandrakes is made certain by the rendering of the Septuagint (μῆλα μανδραγορῶν), of Josephus (μανδραγόρου μῆλα, *Antiquit. Jud.* i. 19, 8), and of the Vulgate (*mandragoras*). My learned and ingenious friend, Dr.

when Rachel saw the love-apples that the boy Reuben had brought home, the sight of them stirred in her a longing to be, like her sister Leah, the happy mother of children; for Leah had four sturdy boys, but Rachel was childless, though her husband Jacob loved her and consorted with her more than with Leah. So Rachel begged Leah to give her of the love-apples that she, too, might conceive and bear a son. But Leah, jealous of the preference shown by her husband to her sister, was angry and answered, saying, "Is it a small matter that thou hast taken away my husband? and wouldest thou take away my son's mandrakes also?" Nevertheless, Rachel urged her to give her of the apples, saying, "Give me of them, and to-night Jacob shall sleep with thee instead of with me." To this Leah consented and gave her sister some of the love-apples.

How Rachel conceived Joseph by eating of the mandrakes.

And at evening, when the sun was setting and the asses, almost buried under corn-sheaves, like moving ricks, were seen returning from the harvest fields along the narrow path on the mountain side,[1] Leah, who had been watching for them, went out to meet her husband as he plodded wearily home from the reaping, and there in the gloaming, with an arch or a wistful smile, she told him of the bargain she had struck with her sister. So he turned in to her that night, and she conceived and bare Jacob a fifth son. But Rachel ate of the mandrakes which her sister had given her, and having eaten of them, she also conceived and bare a son, and she called his name Joseph.[2]

The belief that the mandrake can fertilize women is still current in Palestine.

Such appears to have been the original Hebrew tradition as to the birth of Joseph: his mother got him by eating of a mandrake. But the pious editor of Genesis, shocked at the intrusion of this crude boorish superstition into the patriarchal narrative, drew his pen through the unedifying part of the

Rendel Harris, would deduce the Greek goddess of love, Aphrodite, from the superstition as to the fertilizing virtue of the mandrake, and he proposes to derive the name of the goddess from *pri* (פְּרִי) and *dudai* (דּוּדָי), so that the compound name *pridudai* would mean "fruit of the mandrake." See Rendel Harris, "The Origin of the Cult of Aphrodite," *The Ascent of Olympus* (Manchester, 1917), pp. 131 *sqq.*

[1] I have ventured to transfer to antiquity the description of the return from the harvest field, as it may be witnessed in Palestine at the present time. In the East such scenes have probably altered but little since the days of Jacob. See C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land*, p. 206.

[2] Genesis xxx. 14-24.

story which traced Rachel's first pregnancy to the eating of the yellow berries, replacing it by the decorous phrase, "God remembered Rachel, and God hearkened to her, and opened her womb."[1] Nevertheless, though this curious piece of folk-lore was struck out of the text of Genesis some thousands of years ago, the popular belief in the magical virtue of the mandrake to ensure conception was by no means thereby eradicated, for it has survived among the natives of Palestine to the present time. When Henry Maundrell visited the high priest of the Samaritans at Nablûs, the ancient Shechem, in 1697, he inquired into the story of Rachel and the mandrakes. "I demanded of him," he says, "what sort of plant or fruit the *dudaim* or (as we translate it) *mandrakes* were, which Leah gave to Rachel, for the purchase of her husband's embraces? He said they were plants of a large leaf, bearing a certain sort of fruit, in shape resembling an apple, growing ripe in harvest, but of an ill savour, and not wholesome. But the virtue of them was to help conception, being laid under the genial bed. That the women were often wont to apply it, at this day, out of an opinion of its prolifick virtue. Of these plants I saw several afterwards in the way to Jerusalem; and if they were so common in Mesopotamia, as we saw them hereabout, one must either conclude that these could not be the true mandrakes (*dudaim*), or else it would puzzle a good critick to give a reason, why Rachel should purchase such vulgar things at so beloved and contested a price."[2] And again, the late Canon Tristram, one of our principal authorities on the natural history of Palestine, tells us that "the mandrake is universally distributed in all parts of Palestine, and its fruit is much valued by the natives, who still hold to the belief, as old as the time of Rachel, that when eaten it ensures conception. It is a very striking-looking plant, and at once attracts

[1] Compare *The Century Bible, Genesis*, edited by W. H. Bennett, D.D., p. 293, "Probably in the original form of the story Rachel conceived through the help of the mandrakes; but this seemed to the more enlightened editors of later days a piece of heathen superstition. Hence it was omitted, and there is no sequel to Rachel's acquisition of the mandrakes, as far as she is concerned. We read instead, in verse 22, the more seemly statement of the Elohist, 'God opened her womb.'" The view taken by H. Gunkel is similar (*Genesis übersetzt und erklärt*,[3] Göttingen, 1910, p. 335).

[2] Henry Maundrell, *A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter, A.D. 1697* (Perth, 1800), p. 96 (under date March 24th).

attention from the size of its leaves and the unusual appearance of its blossom. We found it in flower at Christmas in warm situations, and gathered the fruit in April and May. Wheat harvest is, therefore, the period of its ripening generally."[1] The blossoms of the plant are cup-shaped and of a rich purple hue.[2] We can now understand why, in the exquisite picture of love and springtime in the Song of Songs, the lover should blend the smell of the mandrakes with the budding of the vines and the flowering of the pomegranates to lure his beloved out with him at morning into the vernal fields.[3]

Amatory virtues ascribed to the mandrake by the Greeks, both ancient and modern.

The ancient Greeks in like manner ascribed to the mandrake the power of exciting the passion of love, and perhaps, though this is not directly stated, of promoting conception in women; but for this purpose they used, not the fruit, but the root of the plant, which they steeped in wine or vinegar.[4] And because the root was thus used in love charms, they called the mandrake the plant of Circe, after the famous sorceress who turned men into swine through a magic draught.[5] Indeed, so well recognized was the association of the plant with the mysteries of love, that the great goddess of love herself, Aphrodite, was known by the title of Mandragoritis, or "She of the Mandragora."[6] Special precautions were thought by the Greeks to be necessary at cutting or digging up the wizard plant. To secure the first specimen you should trace a circle thrice round the mandrake with a sword, then cut it while you faced westward; and to get a

[1] H. B. Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*[9] (London, 1898), p. 468. Compare Mrs. Hans H. Spoer (A. Goodrich-Freer), "The Powers of Evil in Jerusalem," *Folk-lore*, xviii. (1907) p. 67, "I have seen Jewish and Moslem women seeking for mandrakes, but more likely with an eye to their alleged therapeutic properties (*e.g.* Gen. xxx. 14, etc.) than for the sake of their roots, which, however, they hang in their houses, but whether as curiosities or for purposes of witchcraft, I cannot ascertain."

[2] H. B. Tristram, *op. cit.* p. 467.

[3] Song of Songs vii. 11-13.

[4] Theophrastus, *De Historia Plantarum*, ix. 9. 1. It is to be observed that elsewhere Theophrastus bestows the same name of mandragora (mandrake) on an entirely different plant, which may be the deadly nightshade (*Atropa belladonna*). See Theophrastus, *Enquiry into Plants*, with an English translation by Sir Arthur Hort (London and New York, 1916), ii. 463 (identifications by Sir William Thiselton-Dyer).

[5] Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, iv. 76; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxv. 147. As to Circe, see Homer, *Odyssey*, x. 203 *sqq.*

[6] Hesychius, *s.v.* Μανδραγορῖτις.

second you were recommended to dance round it, talking of love matters all the time.[1] As an additional precaution, you were advised to keep to windward in digging up the root, no doubt, lest the stench should knock you down; for some people found the smell of the mandrake very unpleasant.[2] The amatory properties of the plant are still an article of popular belief in Greece, for in Attica young men carry pieces of mandrake about with them in satchels as love-charms.[3]

The property of fertilizing barren women ascribed to the mandrake in Italy, England, and among the Jews of America.

The same superstition long survived in Italy, for Machiavelli's comedy *Mandragola* turns on the power which the mandrake was supposed to possess of rendering barren women fruitful.[4] Nor were such notions confined to the south of Europe. In the seventeenth century the English herbalist John Gerarde wrote that "great and strange effects are supposed to be in the mandrakes to cause women to be fruitfull and to beare children, if they shall but carry the same neere unto their bodies."[5] Indeed, the Jews still believe in the power of the mandrake to induce fertility; and in America they import roots of it from the East for that purpose. "Here, in Chicago," we are told, "is a man of wealth and influence among the Orthodox Jews; he mourns the fact that no child perpetuates his line; he has been interested in the return of the Jews to Palestine, and has given largely to the cause. The Jews of Jerusalem, knowing of his family sorrow and appreciative of his sympathy, sent him a mandrake with their best wishes. At first this merely indicated to me that the mandrake superstitions still live in Syria, a fact already well known. But questioning soon showed that mandrakes imported from the Orient are still in demand here among Orthodox Jews. They are rarely sold for less than four dollars, and one young man whose wife is barren recently paid ten dollars for a specimen. They are still thought to be male and female; they are used remedially, a bit being scraped into water and

[1] Theophrastus, *De Historia Plantarum*, ix. 8. 8.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxv. 148.

[3] J. Sibthorp, *Flora Graeca*, iii. (London, 1819) p. 27, "*Radicis frustula, in sacculis gesta, pro amuleto amatorio hodie, apud juvenes Atticos, in usu sunt.*" The plant (*Atropa mandragora*) is found near Athens, also in Elis and the Greek islands. It flowers in late autumn. See J. Sibthorp, *op. cit.* iii. 26.

[4] W. Hertz, "Die Sage vom Giftmädchen," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1905), pp. 259 *sq.*

[5] John Gerarde, *The Herball or General Historie of Plantes* (London, 1633), p. 353.

taken internally; they are valued talismans, and they ensure fertility to barren women."[1] So persistent among the Jews is that superstition touching the magical virtue of the plant, which first appears under a decent but transparent veil in the story of Jacob and the mandrakes.

The superstitions which have clustered thick about the mandrake or mandragora in ancient and modern times[2] are partly explicable by the shape of the root, which is often forked and otherwise shaped so as to present a rude resemblance to a human figure.[3] Hence the Pythagoreans, whose so-called philosophy was to a great extent simply folk-lore,[4] called the mandrake the anthropomorphic or man-like plant,[5] and Columella speaks of it as semi-human.[6] The Arabs call it the "face of an idol," or the "man-plant," on account of the strong resemblance of the root to the human form.[7] An

The superstitions concerning the mandrake partly explicable by the human shape of the root, which has earned for the plant the epithet of man-like.

[1] Frederick Starr, "Notes upon the Mandrake," *The American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal*, xxiii. (Chicago, 1901) p. 267.

[2] Much has been written on the folk-lore of the mandrake. Among modern writings on the subject it may suffice to refer to Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, bk. ii. chap. vi. pp. 72-74 (in *The Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, London, 1686); J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*[4] (Berlin, 1875–1878), ii. 1005 *sqq.*, iii. 352 *sq.*; F. Liebrecht, *Des Gervasius von Tilbury Otia Imperialia* (Hanover, 1856), p. 70 note**; A. Wuttke, *Der deutsche Volksaberglaube*[2] (Berlin, 1869), pp. 98 *sq.*, § 131; A. de Gubernatis, *La Mythologie des Plantes* (Paris, 1878–1882), ii. 213 *sqq.*; Andrew Lang, *Custom and Myth* (London, 1884), pp. 143 *sqq.*, "Moly and Mandragora"; Hilderic Friend, *Flowers and Flower Lore* (London, 1886), pp. 291 *sqq.*, 532 *sqq.*, 647; F. von Luschan, P. Ascherson, R. Beyer, and J. G. Wetzstein, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 1891* (Berlin, 1891), pp. (726)-(746), (890)-(892) (appended to the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxiii. 1891); P. J. Veth, "De Alruin en de Heggerank," *Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie*, vii. (1894) pp. 81-88, 199-205; Frederick Starr, "Notes on the Mandragora," *The American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal*, xxiii. (1901) pp. 258-268; W. Hertz, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1905), pp. 273-275; Ch. Brewster Randolph, "The Mandragora of the Ancients in Folk-lore and Medicine," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. xl. No. 12, January 1905, pp. 487-537; E. S. Hartland, *Primitive Paternity* (London, 1909), i. 44-47; Rendel Harris, "The Origin of the Cult of Aphrodite," *The Ascent of Olympus* (Manchester, 1917), pp. 107-140. Our word mandrake is a corruption of the Greek *mandragoras*.

[3] See the coloured plate (No. 232) in J. Sibthorp's *Flora Graeca*, vol. iii., facing p. 26. The plate is reproduced, without colours, in Rendel Harris's *The Ascent of Olympus*, plate facing p. 107.

[4] On this subject I may refer to my article, "Some Popular Superstitions of the Ancients," *Folk-lore*, i. (1890) pp. 147 *sqq.*

[5] Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, iv. 76.

[6] Columella, *De re rustica*, x. 19 *sq.*

[7] John Richardson, *Dictionary, Persian, Arabic and English* (Oxford, 1777–1780), i. col. 104, *s.v. isterenk.*

old writer tells us that the mandrake was fashioned out of the same earth whereof God created Adam, and that its likeness to a man is a wile of the devil which distinguishes it above all other plants; for that reason, when a mandrake is dug up, it should be placed for a day and a night in a running stream,[1] no doubt in order to wash out the taint of its diabolic association. It is the Greek medical writer Dioscorides who tells us of the epithet "man-like" applied to the mandrake by the Pythagoreans; and in a manuscript of his treatise, which is preserved at Vienna, the epithet is appropriately illustrated by two drawings which represent the plant in human shape with leaves growing out of the head. In one of the drawings the goddess Invention is represented handing the man-like mandrake to Dioscorides, who is seated in a chair; while immediately beneath the mandrake a dog is seen rearing itself on its hind-quarters. An inscription beneath the picture sets forth that the dog is "dragging up the mandragora and then dying." The meaning of this picture and inscription will be explained immediately. In early printed herbals the mandrake is similarly portrayed in human form, sometimes male and sometimes female, with a bunch of leaves growing out of the top of his or her head.[2]

Distinction of sexes in the mandrake.

The distinction of sex in the mandrake is as old as Dioscorides, who says that the male mandrake was white and the female mandrake black.[3] In English folk-lore the two sorts are known as Mandrakes and Womandrakes respectively.[4]

Artificial mandrakes produced and sold as charms in modern Europe.

In modern times the high value set on the mandrake as a potent charm, especially useful for its power of fertilizing barren women, has given rise to a trade in counterfeit mandrakes carved in human form out of bryony and other roots. The use of substitutes for the mandrake was all the more necessary in northern countries, because the plant grows wild only in lands about the Mediterranean, including Syria, Cilicia, Crete, Sicily, Spain, and North Africa.[5] The most

[1] Hildegard, *Phys.* ii. 102, quoted by J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*,[4] ii. 1007.

[2] J. Rendel Harris, *The Ascent of Olympus*, p. 115, with the annexed plates.

[3] Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, iv. 76. The same distinction is made by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxv. 147), who here copies from Dioscorides.

[4] John Parkinson, *Theatrum Botanicum* (London, 1640), p. 343.

[5] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, xv. 476, *s.v.* "Mandrake."

northerly point where it has been certainly found is Mount Vicentin, on the southern edge of the Venetian Alps. Specimens are reported to have been found in the Tyrol, but these reports seem to be disputed.[1] A Tuscan doctor of the sixteenth century, by name Andrea Matthioli, who wrote a Latin commentary on Dioscorides, and whose *New Herbal* was translated into German and published at Prague in 1563, learned the secret of these forgeries from a mountebank and quack, whom he had cured in a hospital at Rome. The fellow told the doctor that his practice was to take roots of canes, bryony, or other plants, carve them into the shape of a man or woman, stick grains of barley or millet into the parts of the figures where hair should grow, and then bury them under sand for twenty days or so until the grain had sprouted, when he dug them up and trimmed the sprouts with a sharp knife into the likeness of hair and beards. These false mandrakes he then palmed off on childless women, some of whom gave him as much as five, twenty, or even thirty gold pieces for a single figurine, fondly expecting by its means to become the joyful mothers of children.[2] Bacon was acquainted with such magical effigies, though it does not appear that he suspected the mode in which art assisted nature to invest them with a rich growth of beard. He says, "Some plants there are, but rare, that have a mossy or downy root; and likewise that have a number of threads, like beards; as mandrakes; whereof witches and impostors make an ugly image, giving it the form of a face at the top of the root, and leave those strings to make a broad beard down to the foot."[3] John Parkinson, herbalist to Charles I., writes that "those idle forms of the Mandrakes and Womandrakes, as they are foolishly so called, which have been exposed to publike view both in ours and

Bacon on mandrakes.

[1] R. Beyer, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 1891*, p. (738) (appended to *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxiii., 1891).

[2] A. de Gubernatis, *La Mythologie des Plantes*, ii. 216; Rendel Harris, *The Ascent of Olympus*, pp. 116 *sq.*; R. Beyer, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, 1891*, pp. (739) *sq.*; Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, bk. ii. chap. vi. p. 83 (*The Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, London, 1686). Compare F. Panzer, *Beitrag zur deutschen Mythologie* (Munich, 1848–1855), i. 250 *sq.*, quoting Tabernaemontanus, *Kräuterbuch* (1687), p. 979.

[3] "Natural History," Cent. vii. 616 (*The Works of Francis Bacon*, London, 1740, vol. iii. p. 123).

other lands and countries, are utterly deceitfull, being the work of cunning knaves onely to get money by their forgery."[1] Two such effigies, covered all over their bodies with mock hair, have been preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna since 1680; they formerly belonged to the Emperor Rudolph II., a great patron of all so-called occult sciences. They used to be bathed regularly, and if the bath chanced to be omitted, it is said that they would scream like children till they got it.[2]

Artificial mandrakes produced and palmed off on the credulous in the East.

To this day there are artists in the East who make a business of carving genuine roots of mandrakes in human form and putting them on the market, where they are purchased for the sake of the marvellous properties which popular superstition attributes to them. Antioch in Syria and Mersina in Cilicia particularly excel in the fabrication of these curious talismans. Sometimes the desired form is imparted simply by cutting and pressing the roots while they are still fresh and juicy, or while they are in process of desiccation. But sometimes, when a root has been thus moulded into the proper shape, it is buried again in the ground, until the scars on it have healed, and the parts which had been tied together have coalesced. When such an effigy is finally unearthed and allowed to dry and shrivel up, the traces of the manipulation which it has undergone are often hard to detect. A skilful artist will in this way turn out mandrake roots which look so natural that no native would dream of questioning their genuineness. The virtues ascribed to these figures are not always the same. Some act as infallible love-charms, others make the wearer invulnerable or invisible; but almost all have this in common that they reveal treasures hidden under the earth, and that they can relieve their owner of chronic illness by absorbing it into themselves. This last property, however, has its dark as well as its bright side, for the new owner of the talisman is apt to contract the malady which the previous owner had transferred to it. So popular are these artificial mandrakes in Syria that hardly anybody will look at the natural roots. The Turkish name

[1] John Parkinson, *Theatrum Botanicum* (London, 1640), p. 343.

[2] R. Beyer, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte, 1891*, p. (740) (appended to *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxiii., 1891).

for the root is the "man-root" (*Adam-Kōkii*); the Arabic name is the "servant of health" (*Abdul-selâm*).[1]

Belief that the mandrake grows from the drippings of a man hanged on a gallows.

The human shape of the mandrake root has probably helped to foster, if it did not originate, the weird notion that the plant springs from the drippings of a man hanged on a gallows. Hence in Germany the plant bears the popular name of the Little Gallows Man. It is, or used to be, believed in that country that when a hereditary thief, born of a family of thieves, or one whose mother stole while he was in her womb, is hanged on a gallows, and his seed or urine falls on the ground, the mandrake or Little Gallows Man sprouts on the spot. Others, however, say that the human progenitor of the plant must be, not a thief, but an innocent and chaste youth who has been forced by torture falsely to declare himself a thief and has consequently ended his days on a gallows. Be that as it may, the one thing about which all are agreed is that the Little Gallows Man grows under the gallows tree from the bodily droppings of a hanged man. It is a plant with broad leaves and yellow fruit. But there is great danger in digging it up, for while it is being uprooted it moans, and howls, and shrieks so horribly that the digger dies on the spot. Therefore if you would get it you must proceed as follows: Go to the gallows hill on a Friday evening before the sun has set, having stopped your ears fast with cotton or wax or pitch, and taking with you a black dog that has no patch of white on his body. When you come to the plant make three crosses over it and dig the soil away round its roots, till they remain attached to the earth only by a few slender fibres. Now bring up the black dog; take a string, and tie one end of the string to the animal's tail and the other end to the mandrake. Next hold out a piece of bread to the dog, taking care to keep beyond its reach, and retreating rapidly as you do so. In its eagerness to snatch the bread the dog will strain and tug at the string, and thus wrench the mandrake out of the ground. At the awful yell which the plant utters in the process, the poor dog drops dead to the ground, but you

How to uproot the mandrake with the help of a dog.

[1] F. von Luschan, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte, 1891*, pp. (726)-(728) (appended to *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xxiii., 1891).

have got the mandrake. All you have now to do is to pick up the plant, wash it clean in red wine, wrap it in white and red silk, and lay it in a casket. But you must not forget to bathe it every Friday and to give it a new white shirt every new moon. If you only observe these precautions, the mandrake will answer any question you like to put to it concerning all future and secret matters. Henceforth you will have no enemies, you can never be poor, and if you had no children before, you will have your quiver full of them afterwards. Would you be rich? All you need do is to lay a piece of money beside the mandrake over-night; next morning you will find the coin doubled. But if you would keep the Little Gallows Man long in your service, you must not overwork him, otherwise he will grow stale and might even die. You may safely go the length of half a thaler every night, and you must not exceed a ducat, and even that a prudent man will not lay down every night but only now and then. When the owner of the Little Gallows Man dies, the precious heirloom passes not to his eldest but to his youngest son, who must in return place a piece of bread and a coin in his father's coffin to be buried with him in the grave. Should the youngest son die in his father's lifetime, the mandrake goes to the eldest son; but the youngest son must be buried with bread and money in the grave, just as if he had owned the mystic plant.[1] Some think that the proper time for grubbing up the wondrous root is at dead of night on Midsummer Eve[2]—the witching hour when the year is on the turn and many plants are invested with mystic but evanescent virtues.

Valuable properties ascribed to the mandrake.

Transmission of the mandrake to the youngest son.

[1] Grimm (die Brüder), *Deutsche Sagen*[2] (Berlin, 1865–1866), vol. i. No. 84, pp. 117 *sq.*; J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*,[4] ii. 1006; F. Panzer, *Beitrag zur deutschen Mythologie* (Munich, 1848–1855), i. 250 *sq.*, quoting Tabernaemontanus, *Kräuterbuch* (1687), pp. 250 *sq.* Similar superstitions as to the origin, virtues, and mode of obtaining the mandrake or Little Gallows Man prevail in Lower Austria, Bohemia, and Silesia. See Th. Vernaleken, *Mythen und Bräuche des Volkes in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1859), pp. 253 *sqq.*; J. V. Grohmann, *Aberglauben und Gebräuche aus Böhmen und Mähren* (Prague and Leipsic, 1864), p. 88, § 622, compare *id.* pp. 19, 94, 95, §§ 82, 659, 662; P. Drechsler, *Sitte, Brauch, und Volksglaube in Schlesien* (Leipsic, 1903–1906), ii. 212 *sq.*, § 585.

[2] K. Haupt, *Sagenbuch der Lausitz* (Leipsic, 1862–1863), i. 64 *sq.*, No. 66; P. Drechsel, *Sitte, Brauch, und Volksglaube in Schlesien*, ii. 212. As to the magic plants of Midsummer Eve, see *Balder the Beautiful*, ii. 45 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part vii.).

Thus in German folk-lore the mandrake root is treated as a familiar spirit, who brings treasures both of wisdom and of wealth to his fortunate owner. This mystical aspect of the plant is expressed by its ordinary German name of *alraun*, which, derived from a word identical with our word "rune," means "the all wise one," with the connotation of "witch" or "wizard."[1] In some parts of North Germany the name (*alrun*) is applied to a helpful elf or goblin; hence of a rich man they will say that he possesses such an elf, and of a lucky gamester that he has one of them in his pocket. A woman in Nordmohr has been heard to observe that the goblin is a little man about a foot high, who must be kept in a cupboard and fed on milk and biscuit; on that diet he grows so strong that he can bring a whole wagon-load of rye in his mouth to his owner.[2] Dr. Faust and all wizards and witches were supposed to possess such a familiar spirit.[3] Hence in trials for witchcraft the Inquisition used to inquire whether the alleged culprit owned a familiar of this sort; and many a woman is said to have been burnt as a witch because she kept a puppet carved out of a root (*alrüncken*) and laid it under her pillow at night to dream upon.[4] In 1603 the wife of a Moor was hanged as a witch at Romorantin, near Orleans, because she kept and daily fed a mandrake-goblin in the likeness of a female ape.[5] One of the articles of accusation against Joan of Arc was that "the said Joanna was once wont to carry a mandrake in her bosom, hoping by means of it to enjoy prosperity in riches and temporal things, alleging that the said mandrake had such a power and effect." This accusation the Maid utterly denied. Being asked what she did with her mandrake, she replied that she never had one, but she had heard say there was one near her town, though she had never

The mandrake treated as a familiar spirit who brings wealth to its owner.

Joan of Arc and the mandrake.

[1] J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*,[4] i. 334 *sq.*, ii. 1005 *sq.* Compare Du Cange, *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis* (Paris, 1733–1736), i. coll. 346, 362, *svv. Alraunæ* and *Alyrumnæ*.

[2] A. Kuhn und W. Schwartz, *Norddeutsche Sägen, Märchen, und Gebräuche* (Leipsic, 1848), p. 423, § 220.

[3] K. Haupt, *Sagenbuch der Lausitz*, i. 65, § 66.

[4] K. Bartsch, *Sägen, Märchen und Gebräuche aus Mecklenburg* (Vienna, 1879–1880), ii. 39, §§ 39[a], 39[b]. Compare R. Kühnau, *Schlesische Sagen* (Leipsic and Berlin, 1910–1913) iii. 16, No. 1366.

[5] Hilderic Friend, *Flowers and Flower Lore* (London, 1886), p. 532.

seen it. Moreover, she had been told that a mandrake is a dangerous thing and difficult to keep; she did not know what it was used for. Questioned further about the particular mandrake which she admitted to have heard about, she answered that she had been told it was in the ground under a hazel-tree, but the exact spot she did not know. Interrogated as to the use to which a mandrake is put, she replied that she had heard that it causes money to come, but she did not believe it, and the voices which spoke to her had never said anything to her on the subject.[1]

Superstitions touching the mandrake in Wales and England.

These quaint superstitions touching the mandrake, or any plant which served as a substitute for it, appear to have been widely distributed over Europe. "In many parts of Wales the black bryony, with its dark green and glossy leaves and brilliant red berries, which clings to trees and shrubs and has no tendrils, was known as the mysterious and uncanny mandrake. The leaves and fruit were called 'charnel food,' and formerly it was supposed only to grow beside the gallows-tree or near cross-roads. Witches gathered the leaves and flowers, and uprooted the plant for magical purposes. When uprooted it shrieked and groaned like a sensible human being, and its agony was dreadful to hear. From its stalk a sweat like blood oozed, and with each drop a faint scream was heard. There was an old saying that people who uprooted the mandrake would die within a year. They would die groaning as the mandrake died, or approach their death raving, or uttering penitent prayers for having uprooted the unholy plant. Witches kept the mandrake, and were said to sell portions of it to people who wanted to find out secrets, to wives who desired offspring, and to people who wished for wisdom."[2] The English herbalist, John Gerarde, mentions, only to ridicule as old wives' fables, the belief that the plant grew under a gallows from the drippings of a corpse, that it

The shrieks of the mandrake when uptorn.

[1] Jules Quicherat, *Procès de Condamnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*, i. (Paris, 1841) pp. 213 *sq.*

[2] Marie Trevelyan, *Folk-lore and Folk-stories of Wales* (London, 1909), pp. 92 *sq.* After mentioning the belief that the mandrake grew from the tears of an innocent man hanged on the gallows, the writer adds, "It was also supposed to grow mysteriously near the cross-roads where suicides were buried." But whether this last belief was general or peculiar to Wales does not appear.

shrieked when it was torn from the earth, and that it should be extracted by being tied to a dog.[1] Shakespeare was clearly familiar with the fantastic story, for he speaks of

Shakespeare on the mandrake.

> "*Shrieks like mandrakes' torn out of the earth,*
> *That living mortals, hearing them, run mad.*"[2]

and again,

> "*Would curses kill, as doth the mandrake's groan?*"[3]

He was acquainted also with the soporific property which popular opinion ascribed to the plant. Thus in the absence of her lover Cleopatra is made to cry:

> "*Give me to drink mandragora . . .*
> *That I might sleep out this great gap of time*
> *My Antony is away.*"[4]

And again, at sight of the victim whom his vile insinuations had for ever robbed of his peace of mind, the villain Iago mutters:

> "*Not poppy, nor mandragora,*
> *Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,*
> *Shall ever medicine thee to that sweet sleep*
> *Which you owedst yesterday.*"[5]

Soporific and narcotic quality attributed to the mandrake in antiquity.

The belief in the soporific and narcotic quality of mandragora or mandrake is very old; the ancient Greeks held it so firmly that they administered the drug as an anaesthetic to patients undergoing surgical operations,[6] and this practice was continued into the Middle Ages, being recommended, for example, by the Arabian physician Avicenna in the eleventh century.[7] Allusions to the drowsy effect of the plant are not uncommon in Greek writers.

[1] John Gerarde, *The Herball or General Historie of Plantes* (London, 1633), p. 351.

[2] *Romeo and Juliet*, Act iv. Scene iii. Drayton also speaks of "the mandrake's dreadful groans." See the poem quoted in "The Folk-lore of Drayton," *The Folk-lore Journal*, iii. (1885) p. 153.

[3] Second Part of *Henry VI.* Act iii. Scene ii.

[4] *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act i. Scene v.

[5] *Othello*, Act iii. Scene iii.

[6] Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, iv. 76. Compare Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxv. 150; Isidore, *Origines*, xvii. 9. 30.

[7] Ch. Brewster Randolph, "The Mandragora of the Ancients in Folk-lore and Medicine," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, vol. xl. No. 12 (January 1905), pp. 513 *sqq.* Compare John Parkinson, *Theatrum Botanicum* (London, 1640), p. 345.

Xenophon represents Socrates as saying that wine lulls care to sleep as mandragora lulls men's bodies.[1] Plato compares the philosopher among common men to the master of a ship whom his crew have reduced to a state of torpor by wine or mandragora.[2] Inveighing against Philip of Macedon, and attempting to rouse his countrymen to a sense of their danger, Demosthenes declared that they were as lethargic as men who had drunk mandragora or some other soporific.[3] Aristotle includes mandragora with poppies and darnel among the things that induce slumber and heaviness.[4] The Carthaginian general Maharbal is said to have captured or slain a host of rebels whom he had contrived to drug with a mixture of mandragora and wine;[5] and Cæsar is reported to have overcome by a similar stratagem the Cilician pirates by whom he had been captured.[6] Lucian describes the city of Sleep surrounded by a wood in which the trees were tall poppies and mandragoras, with a multitude of bats perched on the boughs.[7]

Belief of the French peasantry that the mandrake is an inexhaustible source of wealth.

The notion that the mandrake, if properly treated, was an inexhaustible source of wealth to its lucky owner, must doubtless have greatly contributed to enhance the popularity of the plant with that indolent and credulous portion of mankind who are always on the look-out for shorter cuts to riches than the tedious and roundabout road of honest industry. In this capacity the mandrake appears to have appealed strongly to the saving and thrifty disposition of the French peasantry. "The *Journal of a Citizen of Paris*, written in the fifteenth century, speaks of this superstition. 'At that time,' says the anonymous author, 'Brother Richard, a Franciscan, caused to be burned certain *madagfoires* (mandragoras, mandrakes), which many foolish people kept and had such faith in that rubbish as to believe firmly for a truth that so long as they had it they should never be poor, provided that it was wrapt up in fine cloths of silk or linen.' This superstition lasted into the eighteenth century. 'There has long prevailed in France,' says Sainte-Palaye, 'an

[1] Xenophon, *Convivium*, ii. 24.
[2] Plato, *Republic*, vi. 4. p. 488 C.
[3] Demosthenes, *Philipp.* iv. 6, pp. 132 *sq.*
[4] Aristotle, *De somnio*, 3, p. 456 B 30, ed. Im. Bekker (Berlin, 1831–1870).
[5] Frontinus, *Stratagem.* ii. 5. 12.
[6] Polyaenus, *Strateg.* viii. 23. 1.
[7] Lucian, *Vera Historia*, ii. 33.

almost general superstition concerning mandragora; a relic of it still lingers among the peasants. One day, when I asked a peasant why he gathered mistletoe, he said that at the foot of the oaks which bore mistletoe there was a *hand of glory* (*main de gloire*, that is, in their language, *mandragora*); that it was as deep in the earth as the mistletoe was high on the tree; that it was a sort of mole; that he who found it was obliged to give it food, whether bread, or meat, or anything else, and that what he had given it he must give it every day and in the same quantity, otherwise it would kill those who failed to do so. Two men of his country, whom he named to me, had perished in that way, but to make up for it the *hand of glory* gave back twofold next day what any one had given it the day before. If to-day it received food to the value of a crown, he who had given it would receive two crowns next day, and so with everything else; such and such a peasant, whom he named to me, and who had become very rich, was thought to have found one of these *hands of glory*.'"[1] French fishermen used to wear necklaces or bracelets of mandrakes as talismans which would protect them against accidents of all sorts.[2]

The use of a dog to uproot the mandrake.

The belief concerning the danger of uprooting the mandrake, and the expediency of deputing the perilous task to a dog, is not confined to the centre and north of Europe, for it occurs also in the Abruzzi, where the season recommended for culling the mysterious plant is Midsummer Day, the day which the Catholic Church has dedicated to St. John the Baptist.[3] In modern Greece also it is believed that any man who dug a mandrake clean out of the earth would die, and that to get it you must tether a dog to the root.[4] Nor is the device of employing a dog for such a purpose a modern invention. It is recommended by a late writer of

[1] A. Chéruel, *Dictionnaire Historique des Institutions, Mœurs, et Coutumes de la France*, Sixième Edition (Paris, 1884), ii. 726 *sq.* Compare P. Sébillot, *Le Folk-lore de France* (Paris, 1904–1907), iii. 487, quoting *Les Evangiles des Quenouilles*, ii. 2.

[2] J. L. M. Noguès, *Les Mœurs d'Autrefois en Saintonge et en Aunis* (Saintes, 1891), pp. 147 *sq.*

[3] Antonio di Nino, *Usi Abruzzesi* (Florence, 1879–1883), i. 86 *sq.*; A. de Gubernatis, *La Mythologie des Plantes*, ii. 215 note [1].

[4] P. Ascherson, in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte, 1891*, p. (732) note, quoting Th. v. Heldreich, *Nutzpfl. Griechenl.*, pp. 36 *sq.*

Apuleius Platonicus on the uprooting of the mandrake by a dog.

antiquity, who bore or assumed the name of Apuleius Platonicus and composed a treatise on herbs, perhaps in the fifth century of our era. The last chapter of his work is devoted to the mandrake, and describes how the plant is to be uprooted by a hungry dog, who has been tied to it and drags the plant out of the earth in his efforts to get at a piece of meat placed beyond his reach. This work was translated into Anglo-Saxon, and the manuscripts of the translation are adorned with illustrations which represent, among other things, the extraction of the mandrake by the dog. In one of these pictures the plant is delineated in human form with leaves and berries growing out of the head, while the dog is seen tugging at a chain by which his neck is fastened to the left arm of the figure. On the other side of the mandrake are two human figures carrying implements of some sort, perhaps for the purpose of digging up the mandrake. The manuscript which contains this illustration was originally in the Cottonian Library, but is now in the British Museum. Though sadly damaged by fire, it must once have been a splendid volume, beautifully written and decorated with a large number of coloured figures of plants and animals. In another Anglo-Saxon manuscript of Apuleius the mandrake is represented with a human trunk and limbs, but with vegetable extremities, the human head being replaced by a bunch of leaves, and the hands and feet by branching roots; the dog is seen fastened by his tail to the roots which stand for the left hand of the mandrake.[1]

The use of a dog to uproot the *aglaophotis* or peony.

But the use of a dog to uproot a plant, which it would be fatal for a man to extract, can be traced still farther back than the fifth century of our era. In the second century A.D. the Roman writer Aelian, author of a gossipy work in Greek on the nature of animals, gave a similar account of the way to obtain a certain plant which he calls *aglaophotis*, or "bright shining," because it was said to shine like a star or like fire by night, but to be hardly visible, or

[1] J. F. Payne, M.D., *English Medicine in the Anglo-Saxon Times* (Oxford, 1904), pp. 62 *sq.*, 72 *sq.*, with the plates, figures 3 and 5, compare 4. The Apuleius of this treatise (*Herbarium*) is not to be confounded with the far more famous writer of the second century A.D., the author of *The Golden Ass*.

at least hardly distinguishable from surrounding plants, by the light of day. This remarkable plant is supposed by moderns to be the peony.[1] When the herb-gatherers desired to collect specimens of the peony, as we may call it, they put a mark at the root of the plant and returned to the spot at night, bringing with them a young dog, which had been kept without food for several days. They did not dare to uproot the plant with their hands nor even to dig it up with a spade, because the first person who had tried to do so was said to have perished in the attempt. So they tied one end of a very strong cord to the dog, and having made the other end of the cord into a loop they threw it over the stalk of the peony, standing as far from the plant as they could. Then they offered savoury cooked meat to the dog, and he, smelling the sweet savour and impelled by the pangs of hunger, struggled to get at the tempting viand, straining at the leash till it uprooted the peony. But no sooner did the sunlight fall on the roots of the peony than the dog died. So the herb-gatherers buried him on the spot and performed certain secret rites in honour of the animal, because they believed that he had sacrificed his life for theirs. Having done so they could safely handle the peony and carry it home. There they employed it for many useful purposes, particularly for the cure of epilepsy and of blindness caused by a "drop serene." And on account of the mode in which the plant was procured it received the special name of *kynospastos* or "dog-dragged."[2]

Superstitions as to the digging of the peony.

The identification of Aelian's *aglaophotis* with the peony seems to be fairly certain, since Dioscorides, a good authority, gives *aglaophotis* as one of the many names which the Greeks applied to the peony.[3] Moreover, we know from Theophrastus that in the opinion of some people the peony, like the *aglaophotis*, should only be dug at night, for if a man attempted to do it by day and were seen by a woodpecker while he was gathering the fruit, he would risk losing his eyesight, and if the bird saw him cutting the root, he would suffer from *prolapsus ani*; at least so thought

[1] H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*[7] (Oxford, 1883), p. 311, *s.v.* γλυκυσίδη.

[2] Aelian, *De natura animalium*, xiv. 27.

[3] Dioscorides, *De materia medica*, iii. 147 (157).

these wiseacres.[1] However, Aelian's account of the *aglaophotis* reminds us of the mandrake, not only in the extraction of the plant by a dog, but also in the bright light which it was supposed to diffuse at night. For the Arabs call the mandrake "the devil's candle, on account of its shining appearance in the night, from the number of glow-worms, which cover the leaves."[2] The authority for this statement seems to be the learned Ibn Beithar, who has been called the Arab Dioscorides. In his dictionary of medicine he gives an account of the mandrake, in which he tells us that the Moors of Andalusia called the plant *sirâǧ el-kotrob*, "lamp of the elves," because its stalk shone by night. Also, he says, the Arabs call it "plant of the idol," because its root has the shape of a man. According to him, King Solomon carried a mandrake in his signet-ring, whereby the jinn were subject to him, and Alexander the Great also employed it in his conquest of the East. The plant, he informs us, is a remedy for all maladies that are caused by jinn, demons, and Satan; likewise it cures lameness, cramp, epilepsy, elephantiasis, insanity, and loss of memory; and in general it affords protection against mishaps of all sorts, including theft and murder. Finally, he not only describes the method of procuring the mandrake by means of a dog but asserts that he had witnessed it in practice, which is possible and not improbable, since he has the candour to add that, contrary to the usual belief, the dog survived the operation.[3]

Arab superstitions about the mandrake.

The Arab doctor's account of the mandrake presents some remarkable points of resemblance to the account which the Jewish historian Josephus gives of a root called by him the *baaras*. According to him, the root grew in the deep rocky ravine which descends from the mountains of Moab to the eastern shore of the Dead Sea and has been famous both in antiquity and in modern times for the abundance of its hot medicinal springs. A little to the

Josephus's account of a plant called *baaras* and the mode of uprooting it by means of a dog.

[1] Theophrastus, *Historia Plantarum*, ix. 8. 6. Compare Pliny, *Natur. Hist.* xxv. 29.

[2] John Richardson, *Dictionary, Persian, Arabic, and English* (Oxford, 1777–1780), i. coll. 104 *sq.*, *s.v. isterenk.*

[3] W. Hertz, "Die Sage vom Giftmädchen," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1905), p. 276, referring to Sontheimer's translation of Ibn Beithar, ii. 14 *sqq.*, 594.

south of the ravine a commanding height is crowned by the ruins of the castle of Machaerus, in the dungeons of which John the Baptist was beheaded.[1] The root which grew in this romantic situation was itself, if we may trust Josephus, very remarkable both in its appearance and in its properties, It was flame-coloured, and at evening it shone like lightning on persons who attempted to approach and seize it. As they drew near, the root retreated before them, and could only be brought to a standstill by such as poured the urine or menstruous blood of a woman upon the fugitive plant. Even then to touch it was certain death, unless the seeker contrived to hang the root from his arm. However, the Jewish historian adds that the root could be procured without danger in another way. The seeker dug round about the root till only a small part of it remained in the earth; then he tied a dog to it and walked away. In its effort to follow him the animal easily pulled up the root but died on the spot, as a sort of vicarious sacrifice for his master, who thereafter could safely handle the plant. The value of the root thus procured at so much risk, adds Josephus, consists solely in its power of expelling the so-called demons or spirits of bad men, which insinuate themselves into the bodies of the living and kill such as do not receive timely assistance. But a simple application of this precious root to the sufferer sufficed to drive out the foul fiend.[2]

The *baaras* perhaps identical with the sulphur plant.

What was the plant about which these queer fables were told? Josephus speaks as if it grew only in one spot of the deep glen, the ancient Callirrhoe, the modern Zerka Ma'in. Canon Tristram, who visited the glen and has given us a vivid description of its wild scenery, its luxuriant vegetation, and its steaming sulphur springs,[3] proposed to identify

[1] Josephus, *Antiquit.* xviii. 5. 2. As to the situation and ruins of Machaerus, see H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Moab*[2] (London, 1874), pp. 253 *sqq.*

[2] Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, vii. 6. 3.

[3] H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Moab*[2], pp. 235 *sqq.* Compare C. R. Conder, *Heth and Moab* (London, 1883), pp. 144-147; (Sir) George Adam Smith, "Callirrhoe and Machaerus," *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement for 1905* (London), pp. 219 *sqq.*; J. Cropper, "Madeba, M'kaur, Callirrhoe," *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement for 1906* (London), pp. 296 *sq.*; *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*,[3] pp. 214 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part iv.).

the plant with a strange crucifer, not unlike a wallflower in form and size, which grows beside the warm natural baths on sulphur deposits, "with its root orange, its stem and bark sulphur colour, its leaves and fruit-pods a brick-dust orange, and its flowers a paler orange. Every portion of it reeked with the odour of sulphur, and altogether it had a most jaundiced look." The plant appeared to have a very limited range. Canon Tristram observed it nowhere but on the sulphur and the basalt rocks near it, and from its situation and appearance he named it the sulphur plant.[1] The yellow and orange hue of this remarkable plant would answer well to Josephus's description of its flame-like appearance, and the apparent limitation of its range to a small area in the glen also tallies with the account of the Jewish historian, which seems to imply that the *baaras*, as he calls it, grew only at one place in the ravine. It has been plausibly proposed to derive the name *baaras* from the Hebrew *ba'ar* (בָּעַר) "to burn."[2] The etymology would harmonize with the flame-like colour of the plant and with the light which it was believed to emit at evening.

The *baaras* may have been the mandrake, though Josephus seems not to have recognized it as such.

On the other hand, the account which Josephus gives of the *baaras* agrees so closely in several respects with Ibn Beithar's account of the mandrake that it is tempting to identify the two plants. For both of them were said to shine by night, both possessed the power of expelling demons, and both were uprooted by a dog. But if the *baaras* was the mandrake, it is difficult to understand why Josephus should not have called the plant by its ordinary name, with which he was certainly acquainted, since in the story of Jacob and the mandrakes he renders the Hebrew *dudaim* by the Greek μανδραγόρου μῆλα "apples of the mandrake." Moreover, the mandrake, as a common plant in Palestine, must have been familiar to him; how then could he assign it a particular habitat in a single ravine and tell such strange stories about it? For these reasons we can hardly suppose that Josephus himself identified the

[1] H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Moab*[2] (London, 1874), pp. 249, 264.

[2] H. Reland, *Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata* (Trajecti Batavorum, 1714), p. 881.

baaras with the mandrake; though it is possible that in Palestine, as elsewhere, popular superstition had woven round the humble plant a web of fable which disguised its true nature beyond recognition.

We cannot say whether the writer in Genesis was acquainted with the more grotesque fables concerning the mandrake.

It must probably remain an open question whether the writer in Genesis, who has bequeathed to us the story of Jacob and the mandrakes, was, or was not, acquainted with the more grotesque fables which have certainly clustered round the plant in later ages. All that we can with tolerable certainty affirm is, that he knew and accepted the popular belief as to the fertilizing virtue of the fruit of the mandrake, and that he ascribed the birth of Joseph directly to the eating of a mandrake by his mother Rachel. A later editor, offended at so crude a relic of rustic superstition, carefully erased this incident from the narrative, leaving us with the picturesque but pointless story of Jacob and the mandrakes, according to which Rachel gave up her husband to her sister without receiving any return except the handful or lapful of common yellow berries which her nephew Reuben had brought back to his mother that May evening from his ramble in the fields.

Later Jewish legend relates how Reuben procured the mandrake by means of an ass.

Yet with regard to the gathering as well as the medicinal effect of the mandrake we may suspect that the writer of the story in Genesis was acquainted with another tradition which either he or his editor judged it better to suppress. At least this is suggested by a later Jewish version of the same story, which relates how Reuben obtained the mandrakes. In this account it is said that Reuben, tending his father's ass during harvest, tethered the animal to a root of mandrake and went his way. On returning to the spot he found the mandrake torn out of the ground and the ass lying dead beside it. In struggling to break loose, the animal had uprooted the plant, which, the writer tells us, has a peculiar quality: whoever tears it up must die. As it was the time of harvest, when any one is free to take a plant from the field, and as the mandrake is, moreover, a plant which the owner of a field esteems lightly, Reuben carried it home. Being a good son, he did not keep it for himself but gave it to his mother Leah.[1]

[1] Louis Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, i. (Philadelphia, 1909) p. 366.

The rest of the story does not differ substantially from the narrative in Genesis.

The writer in Genesis may have known the incident of the ass, but omitted it as unedifying.

Now, in this later Jewish version of the story the ass, accidentally tied to the root of the mandrake, serves the same purpose as the dog purposely tied to the root in modern folk-lore: in both cases the animal extracts the root at the sacrifice of its own life, and thereby enables a human being to obtain the valuable but dangerous plant with impunity. Can the writer in Genesis, to whom we owe the story of Jacob and the mandrakes, have been acquainted with this episode of the extraction of the root by the ass? It seems not impossible that he may have known and even related it, and that the incident may afterwards have been omitted as a vulgar superstition by the same hand which, for the same reason, struck out the reference to the fertilizing virtue of the mandrake, and to the part which the plant was said to have played in the conception and birth of Joseph.

Parallel between the early Hebrew and the Homeric treatment of the cruder elements in legend and myth.

For a comparison of early Hebrew traditions with their Babylonian counterparts enables us to appreciate how carefully the authors or editors of Genesis have pruned away the grotesque and extravagant elements of legend and myth; how skilfully they have uprooted the weeds and left the flowers in the garden of literature; how deftly they have refined away the dross and kept the pure gold in the casket of history. In their handiwork we can trace the same fine literary instinct which has similarly purified the Homeric poems from many gross and absurd superstitions, which, though they bear plain marks of an antiquity far greater than that of Homer, are known to us only through writings of much later ages. And in both cases the fine literary instinct rests on and presupposes a fine moral instinct, which chooses the good and rejects the evil, and, fusing the chosen elements in the crucible of imagination, moulds them into "an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection."

The function of the dog in the common version of the mandrake superstition.

Whether the incident of the ass in the later Jewish story of Jacob and the mandrakes is original or not, it helps us to understand the function of the dog in the common version of the mandrake superstition. The plant, we are told, has a peculiar quality, in virtue of which it kills whoever tears up its root; it is charged, as it were, with an electricity which

will prove fatal to whoever meddles with it, but which, once discharged, leaves the plant safe for anybody to handle. Hence a prudent man who desires to procure the valuable root harnesses an animal to it; the poor animal receives the shock and perishes, while the man profits by its death to get possession of the root at his leisure. So far as appears, therefore, the agent employed to uproot the mandrake might be any animal; an ass would serve the turn quite as well as a dog; all that is required is a living medium to bear the brunt of the fatal contact, and so to render the plant innocuous. This view is confirmed by a parallel Armenian superstition as to the gathering of bryony (*Bryonia alba*), which is the favourite substitute for the mandrake in countries where the mandrake does not grow. Oddly enough, in Armenia bryony is popularly regarded as the king of plants; it is deemed to be not only animated, but man-like. Its roots and berries are used to form a wishing-rod or magic wand, which confers wisdom and power over men and wild beasts. Also they heal various kinds of sickness and drive away evil spirits. Hence the plant is everywhere sought as a precious possession. But it can only be gathered in the month of May, and in gathering it you must say certain prayers. Further, in order to disarm or avert the wrath of the bryony at being uprooted, you are advised to tether a kid or a cock to it in order that the plant may vent its rage on the innocent animal or fowl instead of on you.[1] We are not told that the creature actually uproots the bryony and perishes in so doing, but on the analogy of the mandrake we may infer that such is the popular practice and the popular belief.

An Armenian parallel.

In this Armenian superstition the bryony is plainly described as an animated and manlike creature, who resents being uprooted, and wreaks his anger on the person or animal that does him violence. The same is, no doubt, true of the mandrake, since it is commonly believed to be shaped like a man, to shriek like a man, and sometimes, like a man, to be bathed, fed, and clothed. On this view the danger of uprooting the mandrake springs simply from the human passion of the plant, and this conception is probably more

Personification of the mandrake.

[1] Manuk Abeghian, *Der armenische Volksglaube* (Leipsic, 1899), pp. 60 *sq.*

primitive than that of an impersonal force pervading its fibres and discharging itself, like electricity, with fatal effect on meddlesome intruders.

A dog employed to uproot other plants than the mandrake.

And just as any animal, apparently, may serve to uproot a mandrake, so a dog may seemingly serve to uproot any other valuable but dangerous plant of which a man desires to obtain possession. We have seen that in ancient Greek folk-lore a dog was employed to extract the *aglaophotis* or peony. Similarly, modern gipsies of Transylvania set a black dog to uproot a kind of orchid to which they give the name of the boy-plant (*karengro*), and to which they ascribe the power of promoting conception in women. They begin by scraping away the earth about the root with a knife which has never been used before; then when the root is half laid bare, they tie a black dog by its tail to the plant, and hold out a piece of ass's flesh to the animal. He springs at it, and in doing so wrenches up the orchid by the root. Having got the root, they carve it in the shape of the male organ of generation, and hang it in a little deerskin pouch on the left arm. In this way the orchid, like the mandrake, is believed to help in getting a woman with child.[1]

Attempts to divert or soothe the rage of plants at being uprooted.

In all these cases the plant, whether it is the mandrake, the peony, or an orchid, is apparently personified as a being who feels anger at being uprooted, and whose wrath must be diverted from the human culprit to an innocent animal. Sometimes on such occasions an attempt is made not to divert but to soothe the rage of the plant by making an offering to it. Thus ancient Greek herbalists recommended that when you cut a certain healing plant, which they called after the divine physician Aesculapius, you should insert in the earth a honey-cake and a varied assortment of fruits as payment for the plant which you had uprooted; and similarly they said that when you cut gladwyn you ought to give compensation in the shape of a honey-cake baked of spring-sown wheat, while at the same time you drew three circles round the place with a sword.[2]

Such beliefs and practices illustrate the primitive tendency

[1] Heinrich von Wlislocki, *Volksglaube und religiöser Brauch der Zigeuner* (Münster i. W., 1891), pp. 90 *sq.*

[2] Theophrastus, *Historia Plantarum*, ix. 8. 7. Compare Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxi. 42.

to personify nature, to view it as an assemblage of living, sensitive, and passionate beings rather than as a system of impersonal forces. That tendency has played a great part in the evolution of religion, and even when it has been checked or suppressed in the general mass of educated society, it lingers still among the representatives of an earlier mode of thought, the peasant on the one hand and the poet on the other. No poet, perhaps, has ever felt or expressed this sense of the animation of nature more vividly than Wordsworth. He tells us that

The primitive tendency to personify plants survives in peasants and poets.

> "*'Tis my faith that every flower*
> *Enjoys the air it breathes.*"

And with the pain which the mandrake was supposed to feel at being uprooted, we may compare the pang which Wordsworth seems instinctively to have ascribed to the hazel-trees ruthlessly stripped by him of their boughs one autumn day when, as a boy, he had gone out nutting in the woods.

> "*Then up I rose,*
> *And dragged to earth both branch and bough, with crash*
> *And merciless ravage; and the shady nook*
> *Of hazels, and the green and mossy bower,*
> *Deformed and sullied, patiently gave up*
> *Their quiet being: and, unless I now*
> *Confound my present feelings with the past,*
> *Even then, when from the bower I turned away*
> *Exulting, rich beyond the wealth of kings,*
> *I felt a sense of pain when I beheld*
> *The silent trees and the intruding sky.—*
> *Then, dearest Maiden! move along these shades*
> *In gentleness of heart; with gentle hand*
> *Touch—for there is a spirit in the woods.*"

CHAPTER VIII

THE COVENANT ON THE CAIRN

Jacob resolves to return, with his wives and children, to the land of his fathers.

WHEN Jacob had served his father-in-law Laban for many years, and had acquired great store of sheep and goats by his industry and craft, he grew weary of the long service and resolved to return, with his wives and his children and all that he had, to the land of his fathers. We may surmise that it was not a simple feeling of homesickness which moved him to take this resolution. The morning of life was long over with him, and the warm impulses of youth, if he had ever known them, had ceased to sway his essentially cool and sober temperament. A calm calculation of profit had probably more to do in determining him to this step than any yearning for the scenes of his childhood and any affection for his native country. By a happy combination of diligence and cunning he had contrived in the course of years to draft the flower of the flocks from his father-in-law's folds to his own: he saw that there was little more to be got in that quarter: he had drained the old man as dry as a squeezed lemon, and it was high time to transfer his talents to a more profitable market. But foreseeing that his relative might possibly raise some objection to his walking off with the greater part of the flocks, he prudently resolved to avoid all painful family disputes by a moonlight flitting. For this purpose it was necessary to let his wives into the secret. Apparently he had some doubts how they would receive the communication he was about to make to them, so he broke the subject gently. In an insinuating voice he began by referring to the changed demeanour of their father towards himself; next with unctuous piety he

He acquaints his wives with his purpose.

related how God had been on his side and had taken away their father's cattle and given them to himself; finally, to clinch matters, he told them, perhaps with a twinkle in his eye, how last night he had dreamed a dream, in which the angel of God had appeared to him and bidden him depart to the land of his nativity. But he soon found that there was no need to beat about the bush, for his wives entered readily into the project, and avowed their purely mercenary motives with cynical frankness. They complained that their spendthrift parent had wasted all he had received as the price of their marriage, so that he had nothing left to give or bequeath to them. Hence they were quite ready to turn their backs on him and to follow their husband to the strange far-away land beyond the great river. But before they went off, bag and baggage, the sharp-witted Rachel fortunately remembered, that though their father had been stripped of most of his goods, he still had his household gods about him, who might be expected to resent and punish any injury done to their proprietor. So she contrived to steal and hide them among her baggage, without, however, informing her husband of what she had done, probably from a fear lest a relic of masculine conscience might induce him to restore the stolen deities to their owner.

He sets out, but is overtaken by Laban in Mount Gilead.

The preparations of the worthy family for flight were now complete. All that remained was to await a moment when they might be able to steal away unobserved. It came when Laban went off for some days to the sheep-shearing. Now was the chance. The great caravan set out, the women and children riding on camels and preceded or followed by an endless procession of bleating flocks. Their progress was necessarily slow, for the sheep and goats could not be hurried, but they had a full two days' start, for it was not till the third day that Laban got wind of their departure. With his brethren he hastened in pursuit, and after a forced march of seven days he came up with the long lumbering train of fugitives among the beautiful wooded mountains of Gilead, perhaps in a glade of the forest where the sheep were nibbling the greensward, perhaps in a deep glen where the camels were crashing through the cane-brakes, or the flocks splashing across the ford. An angry

Dispute between Jacob and Laban.

altercation ensued between the two kinsmen. Laban opened the wordy war by loudly reproaching Jacob with having stolen his gods and carried off his daughters as if they were captives of the sword. To this Jacob, who knew nothing about the gods, retorted warmly that he was neither a thief nor a resetter of stolen goods; that Laban was free to search his baggage, and that if the missing deities were found in the luggage of any of Jacob's people, Laban was welcome to put the thief to death. So Laban ransacked the tents, one after the other, but found nothing; for the crafty Rachel had hidden the images in the camel's palanquin and sat on it, laughing in her sleeve while her father rummaged about in her tent.

Jacob's invective against Laban.

This failure to discover the stolen property completely restored the self-confidence of Jacob, who at first had probably been somewhat abashed on being confronted by the kinsman whom he had outwitted and left in the lurch. He now felt that he even occupied a position of moral elevation, and he proceeded to turn the tables on his crestfallen adversary with great volubility and a fine show of virtuous indignation. He dismissed with withering scorn the trumped-up charge of theft which had just been brought against him: he declared that he had honestly earned his wives and his flocks by many years of diligent service: he enlarged pathetically on the many hardships he had endured and the nice sense of honour he had ever displayed in his office of shepherd; and in a glowing peroration he wound up by asserting that if it had not been for God's good help his rascally father-in-law would have turned his faithful servant adrift without a rag on his back or a penny in his pocket. To this torrent of eloquence his father-in-law had little in the way of argument to oppose; he would seem to have been as inferior to his respectable son-in-law in the gift of the gab as he was in the refinements of cunning. A man would need to have a very long spoon to sup with Jacob,

Laban's reply.

and so Laban found to his cost. He contented himself with answering sullenly that the daughters were his daughters, the children his children, the flocks his flocks, in fact that everything Jacob had in the world really belonged to his father-in-law. The answer was something more than

the retort courteous, it even bordered on the lie circumstantial; but neither of the disputants had any stomach for fighting, and without going so far as to measure swords they agreed to part in peace, Jacob to resume his journey with his whole caravan, and Laban to return empty-handed to his people. But before they separated, they set up a large stone as a pillar, gathered a cairn of smaller stones about it, and sitting or standing on the cairn ate bread together. The cairn was to mark the boundary which neither party should pass for the purpose of harming the other, and, more than that, it was to serve as a witness between them when they were far from each other; wherefore they called it in the Hebrew and Syrian tongues the Heap of Witness. The covenant was sealed by a sacrifice and a common meal, after which the adversaries, now reconciled, at least in appearance, retired to their tents—Jacob no doubt well content with the result of his diplomacy, Laban probably less so, but still silenced, if not satisfied. However, he put the best face he could on the matter, and rising betimes next morning he kissed his sons and his daughters and bade them farewell. So he departed to his own place, but Jacob went on his way.[1]

The reconciliation and the covenant at the cairn.

The whole drift of the preceding narrative tends to show that the erection of the cairn by the two kinsmen on the spot where they parted was a monument, not of their friendship and affection, but of their mutual suspicion and distrust: the heap of stones furnished a material guarantee of the observance of the treaty: it was as it were a deed or document in stone, to which each of the contracting parties set his hand, and which in case of a breach of faith was expected to testify against the traitor. For apparently the cairn was conceived not simply as a heap of stones, but as a personality, a powerful spirit or deity, who would keep a watchful eye on both the covenanters and hold them to their bond. This is implied in the words which Laban addressed to Jacob on the completion of the ceremony. He said, "The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from another. If thou shalt afflict my daughters, and if thou shalt take wives beside my daughters,

The cairn personified as a witness and guarantor of the covenant.

[1] Genesis xxxi.

no man is with us; see, God is witness betwixt me and thee." Hence the cairn was called the Watch-tower (*Mizpah*), as well as the Heap of Witness, because it acted as watchman and witness in one.[1]

Rude stone monuments in the region beyond Jordan.

The pillar and cairn of which this picturesque legend was told doubtless belonged to the class of rude stone monuments which are still frequent in the region beyond Jordan, including Mount Gilead, where tradition laid the parting of Jacob and Laban. Speaking of the land of Moab, the late Canon Tristram observes, "Part of our route was by the side of the Wady 'Atabeiyeh, which runs down south to the Zerka, a short and rapidly-deepening valley. Here, on a rocky upland bank, we came for the first time upon a dolmen, consisting of four stones, rough and undressed; three set on end, so as to form three sides of a square; and the fourth, laid across them, forming the roof. The stones were each about eight feet square. From this place northwards, we continually met with these dolmens, sometimes over twenty in a morning's ride, and all of exactly similar construction. They were invariably placed on the rocky sides, never on the tops, of hills; the three large blocks set on edge, at right angles to each other, and supporting the massive stone laid across them, which was from six to ten feet square. They are favourite stations for the Arab herdsmen, whom we frequently saw stretched at full length upon the top of them, watching their flocks. The dolmens appear to be confined to the district between the Callirrhoe and Heshbon: in similar districts to the south of that region, they never occurred. I have, however, in former visits to Palestine, seen many such in the bare parts of Gilead, between Jebel Osha and Gerash. It is difficult to understand why they were erected on these hill-sides. I never found one with a fourth upright stone, and in many instances the edifice had fallen, but in such cases the heap always consisted of four blocks, neither more nor less. From the shallowness of the soil, there could have been no sepulture here underground; and there are no traces of any cairns or other sepulchral erections in the neighbourhood. It is possible that the primaeval

[1] Genesis xxxi. 48-52.

inhabitants erected these dolmens in many other situations, but that they have been removed by the subsequent agricultural races, who left them undisturbed only on these bare hill-sides, which can never have been utilized in any degree for cultivation. Still it is worthy of notice that the three classes of primaeval monuments in Moab—the stone circles, dolmens, and cairns—exist, each in great abundance, in three different parts of the country, but never side by side: the cairns exclusively in the east, on the spurs of the Arabian range; the stone circles south of the Callirrhoe; and the dolmens, north of that valley. This fact would seem to indicate three neighbouring tribes, co-existent in the prehistoric period, each with distinct funeral or religious customs. Of course the modern Arab attributes all these dolmens to the jinns."[1]

Stones employed, on the principle of sympathetic magic, to give weight and stability to covenants.

We have seen that when Jacob and Laban had raised a cairn, they ate together, sitting on the stones.[2] The eating of food upon the stones was probably intended to ratify the covenant. How it was supposed to do so may perhaps be gathered from a Norse custom described by the old Danish historian, Saxo Grammaticus. He tells us that "the ancients, when they were to choose a king, were wont to stand on stones planted in the ground, and to proclaim their votes, in order to foreshadow from the steadfastness of the stones that the deed would be lasting."[3] In fact, the stability of the stones may have been thought to pass into the person who stood upon them and so to confirm his oath. Thus we read of a certain mythical Rajah of Java, who bore the title of Rajah Sela Perwata, "which in the common language is

[1] H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Moab*[2] (London, 1874), pp. 300-302. Compare H. Vincent, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente* (Paris, 1914), pp. 408 *sqq.*

[2] In Genesis xxxi. 46 the Revised Version translates "and they did eat there by the heap," where the Authorized Version renders "and they did eat there upon the heap." The parallels which I adduce in the text make it probable that the Authorized Version is here right and the Revised Version wrong. The primary sense of the preposition in question (עַל) is certainly "upon," and there is no reason to depart from it in the present passage.

[3] *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus*, translated by Oliver Elton (London, 1894), p. 16. The original runs thus: "*Lecturi regem veteres affixis humo saxis insistere suffragiaque promere consueverant subjectorum lapidum firmitate facti constantiam ominaturi*" (*Historia Danica*, lib. i. p. 22, ed. P. E. Müller, Copenhagen, 1839).

the same as Wátu Gúnung, a name conferred upon him from his having rested on a mountain like a stone, and obtained his strength and power thereby, without other aid or assistance."[1] At a Brahman marriage in India the bridegroom leads the bride thrice round the fire, and each time he does so he makes her tread with her right foot on a millstone, saying, "Tread on this stone; like a stone be firm. Overcome the enemies; tread the foes down."[2] This ancient rite, prescribed by the ritual books of the Aryans in Northern India, has been adopted in Southern India outside the limits of the Brahman caste. The married couple "go round the sacred fire, and the bridegroom takes up in his hands the right foot of the bride, and places it on a millstone seven times. This is known as *saptapadi* (seven feet), and is the essential and binding portion of the marriage ceremony. The bride is exhorted to be as fixed in constancy as the stone on which her foot has been thus placed."[3] Similarly at initiation a Brahman boy is made to tread with his right foot on a stone, while the words are repeated, "Tread on this stone; like a stone be firm. Destroy those who seek to do thee harm; overcome thy enemies."[4] Among the Kookies of Northern Cachar at marriage "the young couple place a foot each upon a large stone in the centre of the village, and the Ghalim [headman] sprinkles them with water, and pronounces an exhortation to general virtue and conjugal fidelity, together with a blessing and the expression of hopes regarding numerous progeny."[5] In the Kallan caste of Madura, Trichinopoly, and Tanjore, patterns are drawn with rice-flour on a bride's back at marriage, her husband's sister decorates a grinding-stone in the same way, invokes blessings on the woman, and expresses the hope that she may have a male child as strong as a stone.[6] In

[1] T. S. Raffles, *History of Java* (London, 1817), i. 377.

[2] *The Grihya-Sûtras*, translated by H. Oldenberg, Part i. (Oxford, 1886) pp. 13, 168, 282 *sq.*, 381; Part ii. (Oxford, 1892) pp. 45, 188, 260 *sq.* (*Sacred Books of the East*, vols. xxix., xxx.).

[3] Edgar Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), p. 1. Compare Sonnerat, *Voyage aux Indes Orientales et à la Chine* (Paris, 1782), i. 81.

[4] *The Grihya-Sûtras*, translated by H. Oldenberg, Part ii. p. 146.

[5] Lieut. R. Stewart, "Notes on Northern Cachar," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxiv. (1855) pp. 620 *sq.*

[6] *Census of India, 1901*, vol. xv. *Madras*, Part i. *Report*, by W. Francis (Madras, 1902), p. 138.

Madagascar it is believed that you can guard against the instability of earthly bliss by burying a stone under the main post or under the threshold of your house.[1]

Oaths taken upon stones in Scotland.

On the same principle we can explain the custom of swearing with one foot or with both feet planted on a stone. The idea seems to be that the solid enduring quality of the stone will somehow pass into the swearer and so ensure that the oath will be kept.[2] Thus there was a stone at Athens on which the nine archons stood when they swore to rule justly and according to the laws.[3] A little to the west of St. Columba's tomb in Iona "lie the black stones, which are so called, not from their colour, for that is grey, but from the effects that tradition says ensued upon perjury, if any one became guilty of it after swearing on these stones in the usual manner; for an oath made on them was decisive in all controversies. Mac-Donald, King of the Isles, delivered the rights of their lands to his vassals in the isles and continent, with uplifted hands and bended knees, on the black stones; and in this posture, before many witnesses, he solemnly swore that he would never recall those rights which he then granted: and this was instead of his great seal. Hence it is that when one was certain of what he affirmed, he said positively, I have freedom to swear this matter upon the black stones."[4] Again, in the island of Fladda, another of the Hebrides, there was formerly a round blue stone on which people swore decisive oaths.[5] At the old parish church of Lairg, in Sutherlandshire, there used to be built into an adjoining wall a stone called the Plighting Stone. "It was known far and wide as a medium—one might almost say, as a sacred medium—for the making of bargains, the pledging of faith, and the plighting of troth. By grasping hands through this stone, the parties to an

[1] Father Abinale, "Astrologie Malgache," *Les Missions Catholiques*, xi. (1879) p. 482, "*Qui va enterrer un caillou au pied du grand poteau de la case ou sous le seuil de la porte, a l'effet de se donner un destin de poids et de fidélité, après s'être lavé d'un destin d'inconstance.*"

[2] For many examples of swearing on stones, see Richard Lasch, *Der Eid* (Stuttgart, 1908), pp. 41 *sqq.*

[3] Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, 7 and 55; Plutarch, *Solon*, 25; Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, viii. 26.

[4] M. Martin, "Description of the Western Islands of Scotland," in John Pinkerton's *General Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1808–1814), iii. 657.

[5] M. Martin, *op. cit.* pp. 627 *sq.*

agreement of any kind bound themselves with the inviolability of a solemn oath."[1]

Oaths taken upon stones in Africa and India.

Similar customs are observed by rude races in Africa and India. When two Bogos of Eastern Africa, on the border of Abyssinia, have a dispute, they will sometimes settle it at a certain stone, which one of them mounts. His adversary calls down the most dreadful curses on him if he forswears himself, and to every curse the man on the stone answers "Amen!"[2] Among the Akamba of British East Africa solemn oaths are made before an object called a *kithito*, which is believed to be endowed with a mysterious power of killing perjurers. In front of the object are placed seven stones, and the man who makes oath stands so that his heels rest on two of them.[3] At Naimu, a village of the Tangkhuls of Assam, there is a heap of peculiarly shaped stones upon which the people swear solemn oaths.[4] At Ghosegong, in the Garo hills of Assam, there is a stone on which the natives swear their most solemn oaths. In doing so they first salute the stone, then with their hands joined and uplifted, and their eyes steadfastly fixed on the hills, they call on Mahadeva to witness to the truth of what they affirm. After that they again touch the stone with all the appearance of the utmost fear, and bow their heads to it, calling again on Mahadeva. And while they make their declaration they look steadfastly to the hills and keep their right hand on the stone.[5] The Garos also swear on meteoric stones, saying, "May Goera (the god of lightning) kill me with one of these if I have told a lie."[6] In this case, however, the use of the stone is retributive rather than confirmatory; it is designed, not so much to give to the oath the stability of the stone, as to call down the vengeance of the lightning-god on the perjurer. The same was perhaps the intention of a Samoan oath. When suspected thieves swore to their

[1] *Folk-lore*, viii. (1897) p. 399.

[2] W. Munzinger, *Sitten und Recht der Bogos* (Winterthur, 1859), pp. 33 *sq.*

[3] Hon. C. Dundas, "The organization and laws of some Bantu tribes in East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlv. (1915) p. 252.

[4] T. C. Hodson, *The Nāga Tribes of Manipur* (London, 1911), p. 110.

[5] J. Eliot, "Observations on the inhabitants of the Garrow hills," *Asiatic Researches*, iii. Fifth Edition (London, 1807) pp. 30 *sq.*

[6] Major A. Playfair, *The Garos* (London, 1909), p. 75.

innocence in the presence of chiefs, they "laid a handful of grass on the stone, or whatever it was, which was supposed to be the representative of the village god, and, laying their hand on it, would say, "In the presence of our chiefs now assembled, I lay my hand on the stone. If I stole the thing may I speedily die."[1] Samoan oath.

In this last case, and perhaps in some of the others, the stone appears to be conceived as instinct with a divine life which enables it to hear the oath, to judge of its truth, and to punish perjury. Oaths sworn upon stones thus definitely conceived as divine are clearly religious in character, since they involve an appeal to a supernatural power who visits transgressors with his anger. But in some of the preceding instances the stone is apparently supposed to act purely through the physical properties of weight, solidity, and inertia; accordingly in these cases the oath, or whatever the ceremony may be, is purely magical in character. The man absorbs the valuable properties of the stone just as he might absorb electrical force from a battery; he is, so to say, petrified by the stone in the one case just as he is electrified by the electricity in the other. The religious and the magical aspects of the oath on a stone need not be mutually exclusive in the minds of the swearers. Vagueness and confusion are characteristic of primitive thought, and must always be allowed for in our attempts to resolve that strange compound into its elements. Distinction between the religious and the magical aspect of stones in the ratification of oaths.

These two different strains of thought, the religious and the magical, seem both to enter into the Biblical account of the covenant made by Jacob and Laban on the cairn. For on the one hand the parties to the covenant apparently attribute life and consciousness to the stones by solemnly calling them to witness their agreement,[2] just as Joshua called on the great stone under the oak to be a witness, because the stone had heard all the words that the Lord spake unto Israel.[3] Thus conceived, the cairn, or the pillar which stood in the midst of it, was a sort of Janus-figure with heads facing both ways for the purpose of keeping a sharp eye on both the parties to the covenant. And on the Twofold aspect of the cairn in the covenant of Jacob and Laban.

[1] George Turner, *Samoa* (London, 1884), p. 184.
[2] Genesis xxxi. 47-52. [3] Joshua xxiv. 26 *sq.*

other hand the act of eating food together on the cairn, if I am right, is best explained as an attempt to establish a sympathetic bond of union between the covenanters by partaking of a common meal, while at the same time they strengthened and tightened the bond by absorbing into their system the strength and solidity of the stones on which they were seated.

How the moral quality of an oath may be affected by the nature of the ground on which it is taken, is illustrated by a passage of Procopius.

If any reader, afflicted with a sceptical turn of mind, still doubts whether the ground on which a man stands can affect the moral quality of his oath, I would remind him of a passage in Procopius which should set his doubts at rest. That veracious historian tells how a Persian king contrived to wring the truth from a reluctant witness, who had every motive and desire to perjure himself. When Pacurius reigned over Persia, he suspected that his vassal, Arsaces, king of Armenia, meditated a revolt. So he sent for him and taxed him to his face with disloyalty. The king of Armenia indignantly repelled the charge, swearing by all the gods that such a thought had never entered his mind. Thereupon the king of Persia, acting on a hint from his magicians, took steps to unmask the traitor. He caused the floor of the royal pavilion to be spread with muck, one half of it with muck from Persia, and the other half of it with muck from Armenia. Then on the floor so prepared he walked up and down with his vassal, reproaching him with his treacherous intentions. The replies of the culprit were marked by the most extraordinary discrepancies. So long as he trod the Persian muck, he swore with the most dreadful oaths that he was the faithful slave of the Persian king; but as soon as he trod the Armenian muck his tone changed, and he turned fiercely on his liege-lord, threatening him with vengeance for his insults, and bragging of what he would do when he regained his liberty. Yet the moment he set foot again on the Persian muck, he cringed and fawned as before, entreating the mercy of his suzerain in the most pitiful language. The ruse was successful: the murder was out: the traitor stood self-revealed. Yet being one of the blood-royal, for he was an Arsacid, he might not be put to death. So they did to him what was regularly done to erring princes. They shut him up for life in a prison called

the Castle of Oblivion, because whenever a prisoner had passed within its gloomy portal, and the door had grated on its hinges behind him, his name might never again be mentioned under pain of death. There traitors rotted, and there the perjured king of Armenia ended his days.[1]

Cairns as witnesses in modern Syria.

The custom of erecting cairns as witnesses is apparently not extinct in Syria even now. One of the most famous shrines of the country is that of Aaron on Mount Hor. The prophet's tomb on the mountain is visited by pilgrims, who pray the saint to intercede for the recovery of sick friends, and pile up heaps of stones as witnesses (*meshhad*) of the vows they make on behalf of the sufferers.[2]

[1] Procopius, *De bello Persico*, i. 5.

[2] S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day* (Chicago, 1902), pp. 79 *sq.*

CHAPTER IX

JACOB AT THE FORD OF THE JABBOK

Jacob's descent from the mountains of Gilead into the deep glen of the Jabbok.

AFTER parting from Laban at the cairn, Jacob, with his wives and children, his flocks and his herds, pursued his way southward. From the breezy, wooded heights of the mountains of Gilead he now plunged down into the profound ravine of the Jabbok thousands of feet below. The descent occupies several hours, and the traveller who accomplishes it feels that, on reaching the bottom of the deep glen, he has passed into a different climate. From the pine-woods and chilly winds of the high uplands he descends first in about an hour's time to the balmy atmosphere of the village of Burmeh, embowered in fruit-trees, shrubs, and flowers, where the clear, cold water of a fine fountain will slake his thirst at the noonday rest. Still continuing the descent, he goes steeply down another two thousand feet to find himself breathing a hothouse air amid luxuriant semi-tropical vegetation in the depths of the great lyn of the Jabbok. The gorge is, in the highest degree, wild and picturesque. On either hand the cliffs rise almost perpendicularly to a great height; you look up the precipices or steep declivities to the skyline far above. At the bottom of this mighty chasm the Jabbok flows with a powerful current, its blue-grey water fringed and hidden, even at a short distance, by a dense jungle of tall oleanders, whose crimson blossoms add a glow of colour to the glen in early summer. The Blue River, for such is its modern name, runs fast and strong. Even in ordinary times the water reaches to the horses' girths, and sometimes the stream is quite unfordable, the flood washing grass and bushes high up the banks on either hand. On the opposite or southern side the

ascent from the ford is again exceedingly steep. The path winds up and up; the traveller must dismount and lead his horse.[1] It was up that long ascent that Jacob, lingering alone by the ford in the gloaming, watched the camels labouring, and heard the cries of the drivers growing fainter and fainter above him, till sight and sound of them alike were lost in the darkness and the distance.

Jacob remains alone at the ford.

The scene may help us to understand the strange adventure which befell Jacob at the passage of the river. He had sent his wives, his handmaids, and his children, riding on camels, across the river, and all his flocks and herds had preceded or followed them. So he remained alone at the ford. It was night, probably a moonlight summer night; for it is unlikely that with such a long train he would have attempted to ford the river in the dark or in the winter when the current would run fast and deep. Be that as it may, in the moonlight or in the dark, beside the rushing river, a man wrestled with him all night long, till morning flushed the wooded crests of the ravine high above the struggling pair in the shadows below. The stranger looked up and saw the light and said, "Let me go, for the day breaketh." So Jupiter tore himself from the arms of the fond Alcmena before the peep of dawn;[2] so the ghost of Hamlet's father faded at cockcrow; so Mephistopheles in the prison warned Faust, with the hammering of the gallows in his ears, to hurry, for the day—Gretchen's last day—was breaking. But Jacob clung to the man and said, "I will not let thee go,

Jacob encounters a mysterious personage at the ford and wrestles with him till break of day.

[1] W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book, Lebanon, Damascus, and beyond Jordan*, pp. 583 *sqq.*; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*[4] (London, 1882), p. 549. The ford here described is that of Mukhâdat en Nusranîyeh, "the ford of the Christian Woman," on the road between Reimûn and Shihân. It is the ford on the regular road from north to south, and is probably, therefore, the one at which tradition placed the passage of Jacob with his family and his flocks. In describing the gorge and the ford I have followed closely the accounts of Thomson and Tristram, who both passed that way and wrote as eye-witnesses. A very different impression of the scenery of the Jabbok is given by Sir George Adam Smith's eloquent description (*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, London, 1894, p. 584), which probably applies mainly either to the upper or the lower reaches of the river, before it has entered the great cañon or after it has emerged from it into the broad strath of the Jordan. In these districts, accordingly, it would seem that the aspect of the river and its banks is one of pastoral peace and sweet rural charm, a landscape of Constable rather than of Salvator Rosa.

[2] Plautus, *Amphitryo*, 532 *sq.*, "*Cur me tenes? Tempus ⟨est⟩: exire ex urbe prius quam lucescat volo.*"

except thou bless me." The stranger asked him his name, and when Jacob told it he said, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for thou hast striven with God and with men, and hast prevailed." But when Jacob inquired of him, "Tell me, I pray thee, thy name," the man refused to mention it, and having given the blessing which Jacob had extorted, he vanished. So Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, that is, the Face of God; "For," said he, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Soon afterwards the sun rose and shone on Jacob, and as it did so he limped; for in the struggle his adversary had touched him on the hollow of the thigh. "Therefore the children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day: because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew of the hip." [1]

Jacob's adversary was perhaps the jinnee of the river.

The story is obscure, and it is probable that some of its original features have been slurred over by the compilers of Genesis because they savoured of heathendom. Hence any explanation of it must be to a great extent conjectural. But taking it in connexion with the natural features of the place where the scene of the story is laid, and with the other legends of a similar character which I shall adduce, we may, perhaps, provisionally suppose that Jacob's mysterious adversary was the spirit or jinnee of the river, and that the struggle was purposely sought by Jacob for the sake of obtaining his blessing. This would explain why he sent on his long train of women, servants, and animals, and waited alone in the darkness by the ford. He might calculate that the shy river-god, scared by the trampling and splashing of so great a caravan through the water, would lurk in a deep pool or a brake of oleanders at a safe distance, and that when all had passed and silence again reigned, except for the usual monotonous swish of the current, curiosity would lead him to venture out from his lair and inspect the ford, the scene of all this hubbub and disturbance. Then the subtle Jacob, lying in wait, would pounce out and grapple with him until he had obtained the coveted blessing. It was thus that Menelaus caught the shy sea-god Proteus sleeping at high

The wrestling of Greek heroes with water-sprites.

[1] Genesis xxxi. 54-xxxii. For the camels on which Jacob's family rode, see *id.* xxxi. 17.

noon among the seals on the yellow sands, and compelled him reluctantly to say his sooth.[1] It was thus that Peleus caught the sea-goddess Thetis and won her, a Grecian Undine, for his wife.[2] In both these Greek legends the supple, slippery water-spirit writhes in the grip of his or her captor, slipping through his hands again and again, and shifting his or her shape from lion to serpent, from serpent to water, and so forth, in the effort to escape; not till he is at the end of all his shifts and sees no hope of evading his determined adversary does he at last consent to grant the wished-for boon. So, too, when Hercules wrestled with the river-god Achelous for the possession of the fair Dejanira, the water-sprite turned himself first into a serpent and then into a bull in order to give the brawny hero the slip; but all in vain.[3]

Jacob's adversary may have shifted his shape in the tussle.

These parallels suggest that in the original form of the tale Jacob's adversary may in like manner have shifted his shape to evade his importunate suitor. A trace of such metamorphoses, perhaps, survives in the story of God's revelation of himself to Elijah on Mount Horeb; the wind, the earthquake, and the fire in that sublime narrative may in the first version of it have been disguises assumed, one after the other, by the reluctant deity until, vanquished by the prophet's perseverance, he revealed himself in a still small voice.[4] For it is to be observed that water-spirits are not the only class of supernatural beings for whom men have laid wait in order to wring from them a blessing or an oracle. Thus the Phrygian god Silenus is said, in spite of his dissipated habits, to have possessed a large stock of general information which, like Proteus, he only imparted on compulsion. So Midas, king of Phrygia, caught him by mixing wine with the water of a spring from which, in a moment of weakness, the sage had condescended to drink. When he woke from his drunken nap, Silenus found himself a prisoner, and he had to hold high discourse on the world and the vanity of human life before the king would let him go. Some of the gravest writers of antiquity have bequeathed to us a more or less accurate report of the sermon which the jolly

How Midas caught Silenus, and how Numa caught Picus and Faunus.

[1] Homer, *Odyssey*, iv. 354-570.

[2] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, iii. 13. 5; Scholiast on Pindar, *Nem.* iii. 60.

[3] Ovid, *Metamorph.* ix. 62-86; compare Sophocles, *Trachiniae*, 9-21.

[4] 1 Kings xix. 8-13.

toper preached beside the plashing wayside spring, or, according to others, in a bower of roses.[1] By a stratagem like that of Midas it is said that Numa caught the rustic deities Picus and Faunus, and compelled them to draw down Jupiter himself from the sky by their charms and spells.[2]

Custom of propitiating water-spirits at fords.

The view that Jacob's adversary at the ford of the Jabbok was the river-god himself may perhaps be confirmed by the observation that it has been a common practice with many peoples to propitiate the fickle and dangerous spirits of the water at fords. Hesiod says that when you are about to ford a river you should look at the running water and pray and wash your hands; for he who wades through a stream with unwashed hands incurs the wrath of the gods.[3] When the Spartan king Cleomenes, intending to invade Argolis, came with his army to the banks of the Erasinus, he sacrificed to the river, but the omens were unfavourable to his crossing. Thereupon the king remarked that he admired the patriotism of the river-god in not betraying his people, but that he would invade Argolis in spite of him. With that he led his men to the seashore, sacrificed a bull to the sea, and transported his army in ships to the enemy's country.[4] When the Persian host under Xerxes came to the river Strymon in Thrace, the Magians sacrificed white horses and performed other strange ceremonies before they crossed the stream.[5] Lucullus, at the head of a Roman army, sacrificed a bull to the Euphrates at his passage of the river.[6] "On the river-bank, the Peruvians would scoop up a handful of water and drink it, praying the river-deity to let them cross or to give them fish, and they threw maize into the stream as a propitiatory offering; even to this day the Indians of the Cordilleras perform the ceremonial sip before they will pass a river on foot or horseback."[7] Old Welsh

[1] Xenophon, *Anabasis*, i. 2. 13; Pausanias i. 4. 5; Herodotus viii. 138; Plutarch, *Consol. ad Apollon.* 27; Aelian, *Var. Hist.* iii. 18; Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon.* vi. 27; Himerius, *Eclog.* xvi. 5; Cicero, *Tuscul. Disput.* i. 48, 114; Virgil, *Eclog.* vi. 13 *sqq.*, with the commentary of Servius on the passage.

[2] Ovid, *Fasti*, iii. 289-348.

[3] Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 737-741. As to the Greek worship of rivers, see the evidence collected by R. Karsten, *Studies in Primitive Greek Religion* (Helsingfors, 1907), pp. 29 *sqq.*

[4] Herodotus vi. 76.

[5] Herodotus vii. 113.

[6] Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 24.

[7] (Sir) Edward B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*[2] (London, 1873), ii. 210.

people "always spat thrice on the ground before crossing water after dark, to avert the evil influences of spirits and witches." [1]

Rivers worshipped by the Bantu tribes of South Africa.

A Zulu story relates how a man named Ulangalasenzantsi went to fetch his children, taking ten oxen with him. His way was barred by ten swollen rivers, to each of which he sacrificed an ox, whereupon the river divided and allowed him to pass through. As to this we are told that "it is a custom among native tribes of South Africa to pay respect to rivers, which would appear to intimate that formerly they were worshipped, or rather that individual rivers were supposed to be the dwelling-place of a spirit. Thus, when a river has been safely crossed, it is the custom in some parts to throw a stone into its waters, and to praise the *itongo*. . . . When Dingan's army was going against Umzilikazi, on reaching the banks of the Ubulinganto, they saluted it, saying, '*Sa ku bona, bulinganto*,' and having strewed animal charcoal (*umsizi*) on the water, the soldiers were made to drink it. The object of this was to deprecate some evil power destructive to life, which was supposed to be possessed by the river. It is a custom which cannot fail to recall what is recorded of Moses under somewhat different circumstances.[2] There can be little doubt that Ulangalasenzantsi threw the oxen into the rivers as a sacrifice to the *amatongo* (ancestral spirits), or more probably to river-gods." [3] From another writer we learn that Kafirs spit on the stones which they throw into the water at crossing a river. He tells us that "the natives in olden days were in the habit of either sacrificing some animal or offering some grain to appease ancestral spirits living in the river. The bushmen used to offer up some game they had killed, or in the absence of that would offer up an arrow. It is very doubtful whether the natives have any fully formed conception of what we call a river-spirit; it seems more probable, on the whole, that they imagined some ancestral spirit to be living in the river, or that some fabulous animal had its home

The water-spirits perhaps identical with ancestral spirits.

[1] Marie Trevelyan, *Folk-lore and Folk-stories of Wales* (London, 1909), p. 6.

[2] Exodus xxxii. 20, "And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it with fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink of it."

[3] Henry Callaway, *Nursery Tales, Traditions, and Histories of the Zulus* (Natal and London, 1868), p. 90.

in the water."[1] The view that these water-spirits are essentially spirits of ancestors is confirmed by another good authority on the Bantu tribes of South Africa. Speaking of the Thonga, who inhabit Mozambique about Delagoa Bay, Mr. Henri A. Junod says, "Some lakes and rivers are believed to be inhabited by spirits, but not in the ordinary fetichistic way, as if they were a special spiritual being incorporated with the natural object; these spirits are *psikwembo*, spirits of the deceased ancestors of the owners of the land, and they are propitiated by their descendants. Should another clan have invaded the territory where those lakes are, should crocodiles threaten fishermen, they will call some one belonging to the clan of the old possessors of the country and ask him to make an offering to appease *his* gods. This is the ordinary course, and the more you search the better you identify these lake and river spirits with ancestor gods."[2]

The Bantu tribes of South-East Africa regard river-spirits as malignant and propitiate them with offerings.

Another writer tells us that in the belief of the Bantu tribes of South-East Africa "rivers are inhabited by demons or malignant spirits, and it is necessary to propitiate these on crossing an unknown stream, by throwing a handful of corn or some other offering, even if it is of no intrinsic value, into the water. Of these spirits, the *incanti* corresponds to the Greek Python, while the *Hili* has the appearance of a very small and ugly old man, and is very malevolent. These spirits are never seen except by magicians. To an ordinary person it is certain death to see an *incanti*. When any one is drowned, the magicians say, 'He was called by the spirits,' and this call no one can resist, nor is it safe to interfere in order to save one who is 'called' from drowning. After a death by drowning the doctors prescribe a formal sacrifice to be offered, but the animal is not killed; it is simply driven into the water, and this is deemed sufficient, or it may happen that the form prescribed shall only include the casting of a few handfuls of corn into the water at the spot where the accident happened. At other times the magicians direct the people to assemble at the river and pelt the spirit with stones, and this is done with great good will, every man and woman

[1] Dudley Kidd, *The Essential Kafir* (London, 1904), pp. 9 *sq.*

[2] Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe* (Neuchâtel, 1912–1913), ii. 302.

shouting the most abusive epithets at the demon. This can only be done when a magician is present to avert evil consequences."[1] The spirit who is treated in this disrespectful fashion can hardly be conceived as an ancestor.

Offerings made by the Masai and Baganda to river-spirits at crossing a ford.

When the Masai of East Africa cross a stream they throw a handful of grass into the water as an offering; for grass, the source of life to their cattle, plays an important part in Masai superstition and ritual.[2] Among the Baganda of Central Africa, before a traveller forded any river, he would ask the spirit of the river to give him a safe crossing, and would throw a few coffee-berries as an offering into the water. When a man was carried away by the current his friends would not try to save him, because they feared that the river-spirit would take them also, if they helped the drowning man. They thought that the man's guardian spirit had left him to the mercy of the river-spirit, and that die he must.[3] At certain spots on the rivers Nakiza and Sezibwa, in Uganda, there was a heap of grass and sticks on either bank, and every person who crossed the river threw a little grass or some sticks on the one heap before crossing, and on the other heap after crossing; this was his offering to the spirit of the river for a safe passage through the water. From time to time more costly offerings were made at these heaps; the worshipper would bring beer, or an animal, or a fowl, or some bark-cloth, tie the offering to the heap, and leave it there, after praying to the spirit. The worship of each of these rivers was cared for by a priest, but there was no temple. The Bean Clan was especially addicted to the worship of the river Nakiza, and the father of the clan was the priest. When the river was in flood, no member of the clan would attempt to ford it; the priest strictly forbade them to do so under pain of death.[4] In Uganda, as in ancient Greece, the spirit of a river is sometimes conceived in the form of an animal. Thus the river Manyanja was worshipped under the shape of a leopard, and some people

In Uganda river-spirits are sometimes conceived in the form of animals.

[1] Rev. James Macdonald, *Light in Africa*, Second Edition (London, 1890), pp. 205 *sq.* Compare *id.*, "Manners, Customs, Superstitions, and Religions of South African Tribes," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx. (1891) p. 125.

[2] S. L. and H. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai* (London, 1901), pp. 103 *sq.*

[3] John Roscoe, *The Baganda* (London, 1911), p. 319.

[4] John Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 163, 318.

accounted for this by saying that a leopard had been drowned in the river. From time to time the ghost of the animal took possession of a man, who, under its inspiration, gave oracles in gruff tones and imitated the noises of a leopard. Similarly the rivers Wajale and Katonga were worshipped under the form of a lion, and the human medium who personated them roared like a lion when the fit of inspiration was on him.[1]

Sacrifice offered by the Banyoro at crossing the Nile.

At a place on the Upper Nile, called the Karuma Falls, the flow of the river is broken by a line of high stones, and the water rushes down a long slope in a sort of sluice to a depth of ten feet. The native tradition runs, that the stones were placed in position by Karuma, the agent or familiar of a great spirit, who, pleased with the barrier thus erected by his servant, rewarded him by bestowing his name on the falls. A wizard used to be stationed at the place to direct the devotions of such as crossed the river. When Speke and his companions were ferried over the Nile at this point, a party of Banyoro, travelling with them, sacrificed two kids, one on either side of the river, flaying them with one long cut each down their breasts and bellies. The slaughtered animals were then laid, spread-eagle fashion, on their backs upon grass and twigs, and the travellers stepped over them, that their journey might be prosperous. The place of sacrifice was chosen under the directions of the wizard of the falls.[2]

Sacrifices offered at crossing rivers in Congo-land and Southern Nigeria.

The Ituri river, one of the upper tributaries of the Congo, forms the dividing-line between the grass land and the great forest. "When my canoe had almost crossed the clear, rapid waters, a hundred and fifty yards wide, I noticed on the opposite bank two miniature houses built close to the edge and resembling in every feature the huts of the villagers. The old chief was loth to explain the object of these houses, but at length I was told that they were erected for the shade of his predecessor, who was told that he must recompense them for their labours by guarding the passage of those crossing the river. From that time, whenever a caravan was seen to

[1] John Roscoe, *The Baganda*, p. 318.

[2] John Hanning Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile* (London, 1912), ch. xix. pp. 446, 447 *sq.* (*Everyman's Library*).

approach the bank, a little food would be carried down to the ghost-houses, as a warning that the shade's protection was needed for the caravan about to cross."[1] Among the Ibos of the Awka district, in Southern Nigeria, when a corpse is being carried to the grave and the bearers have to cross water, a she-goat and a hen are sacrificed to the river.[2]

Offerings made by the Badagas of Southern India at crossing rivers.

The Badagas, a tribe of the Neilgherry Hills in Southern India, believe in a deity named Gangamma, "who is supposed to be present at every stream, and especially so at the Koondé and Pykaré rivers, into which it was formerly the practice for every owner of cattle, which had to cross them at their height, to throw a quarter of a rupee, because their cattle used frequently to be carried away by the current and destroyed. It is enumerated amongst the great sins of every deceased Badaga, at his funeral, that he had crossed a stream without paying due adoration to Gangamma."[3] Again, the Todas, another smaller but better-known tribe of the same hills, regard two of their rivers, the Teipakh (Paikara) and the Pakhwar (Avalanche), as gods or the abodes of gods. Every person in crossing one of these streams must put his right arm outside of his cloak in token of respect. Formerly these rivers might only be crossed on certain days of the week. When two men who are sons of a brother and a sister respectively pass in company over either of the sacred streams they have to perform a special ceremony. As they approach the river they pluck and chew some grass, and each man says to the other, "Shall I throw the river (water)? Shall I cross the river?" Then they go down to the bank, and each man dips his hand in the river and throws a handful of water away from him thrice. After that they cross the river, each of them with his arm outside of his cloak in the usual way. But if the day is a Tuesday, Friday, or Saturday they will not throw the water, but only chew the grass. Also, if the funeral ceremonies of a person belonging to the clan of

Ceremonies performed by the Todas at crossing rivers.

[1] Major P. H. G. Powell-Cotton, "A Journey through the Eastern Portion of the Congo State," *The Geographical Journal*, xxx. (1907) pp. 374 *sq.*

[2] N. W. Thomas, "Some Ibo Burial Customs," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvii. (1917) p. 165.

[3] F. Metz, *The Tribes inhabiting the Neilgherry Hills*, Second Edition (Mangalore, 1864), p. 68.

either of the two men are not complete, they will not throw the water. The sacred dairyman (*palol*) of the Todas may not cross either of the holy rivers at the places used by common folk. In the old days there were certain fords where ordinary people waded through the water, but the dairyman had a ford of his own. Nowadays the Todas cross the Paikara by a bridge, but the holy milkman may not make use of the profane convenience. And in the old days no Toda who had been bitten by a snake might cross any stream whatever.[1]

Chiefs and kings forbidden to cross certain rivers.

Among the Mahafaly and Sakalava of southern Madagascar certain chiefs are forbidden to cross certain rivers, while others are bound to go and salute all the rivers of the country.[2] In Cayor, a district of Senegal, it is believed that the king would inevitably die within the year if he were to cross a river or an arm of the sea.[3] A certain famous chief of the Angoni, in British Central Africa, was cremated near a river; and even now, when the Angoni cross the stream, they greet it with the deep-throated manly salutation which they accord only to royalty.[4] And when the Angoni ferry over any river in a canoe they make a general confession of any sins of infidelity of which they may have been guilty towards their consorts, apparently from a notion that otherwise they might be drowned in the river.[5] The Toradjas of Central Celebes believe that water-spirits, in the shape of snakes, inhabit the deep pools and rapids of rivers. Men have to be on their guard against these dangerous beings. Hence when a Toradja is about to make a voyage down a river, he will often call out from the bank, "I am not going to-day, I will go to-morrow." The spirits hear the announcement, and if there should be amongst them one who is lying in wait for the voyager, he

Ceremonies observed by the Angoni at crossing a river.

Attempt of the Toradjas to deceive water-spirits.

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 418 *sq.*, 500 *sq.*

[2] A. van Gennep, *Tabou et Totémisme à Madagascar* (Paris, 1904), p. 113.

[3] J. B. L. Durand, *Voyage au Sénégal* (Paris, 1802), p. 55.

[4] R. Sutherland Rattray, *Some Folk-lore Stories and Songs in Chinyanja* (London, 1907), p. 190.

[5] R. Sutherland Rattray, *op. cit.* p. 194. As to the superstitions which primitive peoples attach to the confession of sins, see *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, pp. 114, 191, 195, 211 *sq.*, 214 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part ii.). Apparently confession was originally regarded as a kind of physical purge.

will imagine that the voyage has been postponed and will defer his attack accordingly till the following day. Meantime the cunning Toradja will drop quietly down the river, laughing in his sleeve at the simplicity of the water-sprite whom he has bilked.[1]

Attempts to wound, coerce, and punish the spirits of rivers.

Though the exact reasons for observing many of these customs in regard to rivers may remain obscure, the general motive appears to be the awe and dread of rivers conceived either as powerful personal beings or as haunted by mighty spirits. The conception of a river as a personal being is well illustrated by a practice which is in vogue among the Kakhyeen of Upper Burma. When one of the tribe has been drowned in crossing a river the avenger of blood repairs once a year to the banks of the guilty stream, and filling a vessel full of water he hews it through with his sword, as if he were despatching a human foe.[2] Among the Santals of Bengal, when water is fetched from a tank for the purpose of bathing a bridegroom at marriage, a woman shoots an arrow into the water of the tank and another woman slashes it with a sword. Then two girls dip up the water in pots and carry it home in procession.[3] The intention of thus shooting and cutting the water before drawing it off may perhaps be to weaken the water-spirit whom you are about to rob. When the Meinam River at Bangkok has attained its highest point, and the flood begins to subside, the king of Siam deputes, or used to depute, some hundreds of Buddhist monks to accelerate the subsidence. Embarking on state barges, these holy men command the waters in the king's name to retire, and by way of reinforcing the royal commands they chant exorcisms. However, in spite of His Majesty's orders and the incantations of the monks, the rebellious river has been known to rise instead of to fall.[4] It is said that once on a time, when the Nile had flooded the land of Egypt to a depth of eighteen cubits, and the waters

[1] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 276.

[2] Clement Williams, *Through Burma to Western China* (Edinburgh and London, 1868), pp. 91 *sq.*

[3] A. Campbell, D.D., "Santal Marriage Customs," *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, ii. (1916) p. 313.

[4] Mgr. Pallegoix, *Description du Royaume Thaï ou Siam* (Paris, 1854), ii. 56; Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam* (London, 1857), i. 9.

were lashed into waves by a strong wind, the Egyptian King Pheron seized a dart and hurled it into the swirling current; but for this rash and impious act he was punished by the loss of his eyesight.[1] Again, we read that when Cyrus, marching against Babylon, crossed the River Gyndes, one of the sacred white horses, which accompanied the march of the army, was swept away by the current and drowned. In a rage at this sacrilege, the king threatened the river to bring its waters so low that a woman would be able to wade through them without wetting her knees. Accordingly he employed his army in digging channels by which the water of the river was diverted from its bed, and in this futile labour the whole summer, which should have been devoted to the siege of Babylon, was wasted to gratify the childish whim of a superstitious despot.[2]

Attempts to punish, fight, and wound the spirits of the sea.

Nor are the spirits of rivers the only water-divinities which bold men have dared to fight or punish. When a storm swept away the first bridge by which Xerxes spanned the Hellespont for the passage of his army, the king in a rage sentenced the straits to receive three hundred lashes and to be fettered with chains. And as the executioners plied their whips on the surface of the water, they said, "O bitter water, thy master inflicts this punishment on thee because thou hast wronged him who did no wrong to thee. But King Xerxes will cross thee, willy nilly. And it serves thee right that no man sacrifices to thee, because thou art a treacherous and a briny river."[3] The ancient Celts are said to have waded into the billows as they rolled in upon the shore, hewing and stabbing them with swords and spears, as if they could wound or frighten the ocean itself.[4] Irish legend tells of a certain Tuirbe Tragmar who, standing "on Telach Bela (the Hill of the Axe), would hurl a cast of his axe in the face of the floodtide, so that he

[1] Herodotus ii. 111; Diodorus Siculus i. 59.

[2] Herodotus i. 189. However, Sir Henry Rawlinson inclined "to regard the whole story as a fable, embodying some popular tradition with regard to the origin of the great hydraulic works on the *Diyálah* [Gyndes] below the Hamaran hills, where the river has been dammed across to raise the level of the water, and a perfect network of canals have been opened out from it on either side" (note in George Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Fourth Edition, vol. i. p. 311).

[3] Herodotus vii. 35.

[4] Aelian, *Varia Historia*, xii. 23.

forbade the sea, which then would not come over the axe."[1] The Toradjas of Central Celebes relate that one of their tribes, which is proverbial for stupidity, once came down to the sea-shore when the tide was out. Immediately they built a hut on the beach below high-water mark. When the tide rose and threatened to wash away the hut, they regarded it as a monster trying to devour them, and sought to appease it by throwing their whole stock of rice into the waves. As the tide still continued to advance, they next hurled their swords, spears, and chopping-knives into the sea, apparently with the intention of wounding or frightening the dangerous creature and so compelling him to retreat.[2] Once on a time, when a party of Arafoos, a tribe of mountaineers on the northern coast of Dutch New Guinea, were disporting themselves in the surf, three of them were swept out to sea by a refluent wave and drowned. To avenge the death their friends fired on the inrolling billows for hours with guns and bows and arrows.[3] Such personifications of the water as a personal being who can be cowed or overcome by physical violence, may help to explain the weird story of Jacob's adventure at the ford of the Jabbok.

The sinew that shrank. Parallels among the North American Indians.

The tradition that a certain sinew in Jacob's thigh was strained in the struggle with his nocturnal adversary is clearly an attempt to explain why the Hebrews would not eat the corresponding sinew in animals. Both the tradition and the custom have their parallels among some tribes of North American Indians, who regularly cut out and throw away the hamstrings of the deer they kill.[4] The Cherokee Indians assign two reasons for the practice. One is that "this tendon, when severed, draws up into the flesh; ergo, any one who

[1] Whitley Stokes, "The Edinburgh Dinnshenchas," *Folk-lore*, iv. (1893) p. 488. Compare Standish H. O'Grady, *Silva Gadelica*, Translation and notes (London and Edinburgh, 1892), p. 518. These Celtic, Persian, and Egyptian parallels have already been cited, with more legends of the same sort, by Mr. E. S. Hartland, in his essay, "The Boldness of the Celts," *Ritual and Belief* (London, 1914), pp. 161 *sqq.*

[2] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 37.

[3] P. E. Moolenburgh, "Enkele ethnografische byzonderheden van de Arafoe's op Noord Nieuw-Guinea," *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, xix. (Leyden, 1902) p. 169.

[4] I have collected the evidence in *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, ii. 264 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part v.).

should unfortunately partake of the hamstring would find his limbs draw up in the same manner."[1] The other reason is that if, instead of cutting out the hamstring and throwing it away the hunter were to eat it, he would thereafter easily grow tired in travelling.[2] Both reasons assume the principle of sympathetic magic, though they apply it differently. The one supposes that, if you eat a sinew which shrinks, the corresponding sinew in your own body will shrink likewise. The other seems to assume that if you destroy the sinew without which the deer cannot walk, you yourself will be incapacitated from walking in precisely the same way. Both reasons are thoroughly in keeping with savage philosophy. Either of them would suffice to account for the Hebrew taboo. On this theory the narrative in Genesis supplies a religious sanction for a rule which was originally based on sympathetic magic alone.

Ancient Mexican parallel to Jacob's wrestling with the nocturnal phantom.

The story of Jacob's wrestling with the nocturnal phantom and extorting a blessing from his reluctant adversary at the break of dawn has a close parallel in the superstition of the ancient Mexicans. They thought that the great god Tezcatlipoca used to roam about at night in the likeness of a gigantic man wrapt in an ash-coloured sheet and carrying his head in his hand. When timid people saw this dreadful apparition they fell to the ground in a faint and died soon afterwards, but a brave man would grapple with the phantom and tell him that he would not let him go till the sun rose. But the spectre would beg his adversary to release him, threatening to curse him if he did not. Should the man, however, succeed in holding the horrible being fast till day was just about to break, the spectre changed his tune and offered to grant the man any boon he might ask for, such as riches or invincible strength, if only he would unhand him and let him go before the dawn. The human victor in this tussle with a superhuman foe received from his vanquished enemy four thorns of a certain sort as a token of victory. Nay, a very valiant man would wrench the heart from the breast of the phantom, wrap it up in a

[1] J. Mooney, "Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees," *Seventh Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, 1891), p. 323.

[2] James Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee," *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (Washington, 1900), Part i. p. 263.

cloth, and carry it home. But when he undid the cloth to gloat over the trophy, he would find nothing in it but some white feathers, or a thorn, or it might be only a cinder or an old rag.[1]

[1] Juan de Torquemada, *Monarquia Indiana* (Madrid, 1723), ii. 578. Compare Bernardino de Sahagun, *Histoire Générale des choses de la Nouvelle Espagne*, traduite par D. Jourdanet et Remi Simeon (Paris, 1880), pp. 297-299, 304 *sq.*

CHAPTER X

JOSEPH'S CUP

Joseph's divining cup.

WHEN his brethren came to Egypt to procure corn during the famine, and were about to set out on their homeward journey to Palestine, Joseph caused his silver drinking-cup to be hidden in the mouth of Benjamin's sack. Then when the men were gone out of the city and were not yet far off, he sent his steward after them to tax them with theft in having stolen his cup. A search was accordingly made in the sacks, and the missing cup was found in Benjamin's sack. The steward reproached the brethren with their ingratitude to his master, who had treated them hospitably, and whose kindness they had repaid by robbing him of the precious goblet. "Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good?" he asked. "Is not this it in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he indeed divineth? ye have done evil in so doing." And when the brethren were brought back and confronted with Joseph, he repeated these reproaches, saying, "What deed is this that ye have done? know ye not that such a man as I can indeed divine?"[1] Hence we may infer that Joseph piqued himself in particular on his power of detecting a thief by means of his divining cup.

Divination by means of images in water in classical antiquity.

The use of a cup in divination has been not uncommon both in ancient and modern times, though the particular mode of employing it for that purpose has not always been the same. Thus in the life of the Neoplatonic philosopher Isidorus we read that the sage fell in with a sacred woman, who possessed a divine talent of a remarkable kind. She used to pour clean water into a crystal cup, and from the appearances in the water she predicted the things that should

[1] Genesis xliv. 1-15.

come to pass.[1] Such predictions from appearances in water formed a special branch of divination, on which the Greeks bestowed the name of *hydromantia*; sometimes a particular sort of gem was put in the water for the sake of evoking the images of the gods.[2] King Numa is said to have divined by means of the images of the gods which he saw in water, but we are not told that he used a cup for the purpose; more probably he was supposed to have beheld the divine figures in a pool of the sacred spring Egeria, to the spirit of which he was wedded.[3] When the people of Tralles, in Caria, desired to ascertain what would be the result of the Mithridatic war, they employed a boy, who, gazing into water, professed to behold in it the image of Mercury and, under the inspiration of the divine manifestation, chanted the coming events in a hundred and sixty verses.[4] The Persians are related to have been adepts in the art of water-divination;[5] indeed the art is said to have been imported into the West from Persia.[6] The report may have been merely an inference from the place which the reverence for water held in the old Persian religion.[7]

Divination by means of images in water (the Magic Mirror) in modern Egypt.

How Joseph used his magic cup for the detection of a thief or for other purposes of divination we do not know, but we may conjecture that he was supposed to draw his inferences from figures which appeared to him in the water. Certainly this mode of divination is still practised in Egypt, and it may have been in vogue in that conservative country from remote antiquity. Its modern name is the Magic Mirror. "The magic mirror is much employed. A pure innocent boy (not more than twelve years of age) is directed to look into a cup filled with water and inscribed with texts, while under his cap is stuck a paper, also with writing on it, so as to hang over his forehead; he is also fumigated with

[1] Damascius, "Vita Isidori," in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. Im. Bekker (Berlin, 1824), p. 347 B. Compare Jamblichus, *De Mysteriis*, iii. 14.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxvii. 192, "*Anancitide in hydromantia dicunt evocari imagines deorum.*" What kind of stone the *anancitis* may have been appears to be unknown.

[3] Varro, in Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vii. 35.

[4] Apuleius, *De Magia*, 42, referring to Varro as his authority.

[5] Strabo xvi. 2. 39, p. 762, ed. Casaubon.

[6] Varro, in Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vii. 35.

[7] Thomas Hyde, *Historia Religionis veterum Persarum* (Oxford, 1700), cap. vi. pp. 137 *sqq.*

incense, while sentences are murmured by the conjuror. After a little time, when the boy is asked what he sees, he says that he sees persons moving in the water, as if in a mirror. The conjuror orders the boy to lay certain commands on the spirit, as for instance to set up a tent, or to bring coffee and pipes. All this is done at once. The conjuror asks the inquisitive spectators to name any person whom they wish to appear on the scene, and some name is mentioned, no matter whether the person is living or dead. The boy commands the spirit to bring him. In a few seconds he is present, and the boy proceeds to describe him. The description, however, according to our own observation, is always quite wide of the mark. The boy excuses himself by saying that the person brought before him will not come right into the middle, and always remains half in the shade; but at other times he sees the persons really and in motion. When a theft is committed the magic mirror is also sometimes questioned, as we ourselves were witnesses on one occasion. (This is called *darb el mandel.*) The accusations of the boy fell upon a person who was afterwards proved to be quite innocent, but whom the boy, as it appeared, designedly charged with the crime out of malevolence. For this reason such experiments, formerly much in vogue, were strictly prohibited by the government, though they are still practised."[1]

Divination by means of images in ink in modern Egypt.

Sometimes in Egypt the magic mirror used in divination is formed, not by water in a cup, but by ink poured into the palm of the diviner's hand, but the principle and the mode of procedure are the same in both cases. The diviner professes to see in the ink the figures of the persons, whether alive or dead, whom the inquirer desires him to summon up. The magic mirror of ink, like the magic mirror of water, is resorted to for the detection of a thief and other purposes. The persons who can see in it are a boy under puberty, a virgin, a black female slave, and a pregnant woman, but apparently a boy under puberty is most commonly employed. A magic square is drawn with ink in the palm of his hand, and in the centre of the square a little pool of ink serves as the magic mirror. While the diviner

[1] C. B. Klunzinger, *Upper Egypt, its People and its Products* (London, 1878), pp. 387 *sq.*

is gazing into it, incense is burnt, and pieces of paper with charms written on them are consumed in the fire.[1] When Kinglake was in Cairo he sent for a magician and invited him to give a specimen of his skill. The magician, a stately old man with flowing beard, picturesquely set off by a vast turban and ample robes, employed a boy to gaze into a blot of ink in his palm and there to descry the image of such a person as the Englishman might name. Kinglake called for Keate, his old headmaster at Eton, a ferocious dominie of the ancient school, short in figure and in temper, with shaggy red eyebrows and other features to match. In response to this call the youthful diviner professed to see in the inky mirror the image of a fair girl, with golden hair, blue eyes, pallid face, and rosy lips. When Kinglake burst into a roar of laughter, the discomfited magician declared that the boy must have known sin, and incontinently kicked him down stairs.[2]

Divination by means of images in water in Scandinavia and Tahiti.

Similar modes of divination have been practised in other parts of the world. Thus, in Scandinavia people used to go to a diviner on a Thursday evening in order to see in a pail of water the face of the thief who had robbed them.[3] The Tahitians "have a singular mode of detecting a thief, in any case of stolen goods, by applying to a person possessing the spirit of divination, who, they observe, is always sure to show them the face of the thief reflected from a calabash of clear water."[4] This latter oracle has been described more fully by another writer. The natives of Tahiti, he tells us, "had also recourse to several kinds of divination, for discovering the perpetrators of acts of injury, especially theft. Among these was a kind of water ordeal. It resembled in a great degree the *wai haruru* of the Hawaiians. When the parties who had been robbed wished to use this method of discovering the thief, they sent for a priest, who, on being informed of the circumstances connected with the theft, offered

[1] E. W. Lane, *Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians* (Paisley and London, 1895), chap. xii. pp. 276-284.

[2] A. W. Kinglake, *Eothen*, ch. xviii. pp. 216-218 (*Temple Classics* edition, London, 1901).

[3] Sven Nilsson, *The Primitive Inhabitants of Scandinavia*, Third Edition (London, 1868), p. 241.

[4] John Turnbull, *A Voyage round the World*, Second Edition (London, 1813), p. 343.

prayers to his demon. He now directed a hole to be dug in the floor of the house, and filled with water; then, taking a young plantain in his hand, he stood over the hole, and offered his prayers to the god, whom he invoked, and who, if propitious, was supposed to conduct the spirit of the thief to the house, and place it over the water. The image of the spirit, which they imagined resembled the person of the man, was, according to their account, reflected in the water, and being perceived by the priest, he named the individual, or the parties, who had committed the theft, stating that the god had shewn him the image in the water."[1]

Divination by means of images in water in the Malay Peninsula, New Guinea, Africa, and among the Eskimo.

When Sir Frank Swettenham had been robbed in the Malay Peninsula, he was introduced to an Arab, who asserted that he would be able to tell him all about the robbery, provided he might fast in solitude for three days in an empty house, but that without such a preparation he could not see what he sought. "He told me that after his vigil, fast, and prayer, he would lay in his hand a small piece of paper on which there would be some writing; into this he would pour a little water, and in that extemporised mirror he would see a vision of the whole transaction. He declared that, after gazing intently into this divining-glass, the inquirer first recognised the figure of a little old man; that having duly saluted this *Jin*, it was only necessary to ask him to conjure up the scene of the robbery, when all the details would be re-enacted in the liquid glass under the eyes of the gazer, who would there and then describe all that he saw."[2] Some diviners in South-Eastern New Guinea profess to descry the face of a culprit in a pool of water into which coco-nut oil has been squeezed.[3] Among the Mossi, a nation of the French Sudan, in the upper valley of the Niger, the royal pages, who are boys under puberty, are bound to observe strict continence. Once a year their chastity is tested as follows. Each page must look at his reflection in a calabash of water, and from the appearance of the reflection it is judged whether he has been chaste or not. In former days,

[1] William Ellis, *Polynesian Researches*, Second Edition (London, 1832–1836), i. 378 *sq.*

[2] (Sir) Frank Athelstane Swettenham, *Malay Sketches* (London and New York, 1895), pp. 201-203; W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (London, 1900), pp. 538 *sq.*

[3] Henry Newton, *In Far New Guinea* (London, 1914), pp. 89 *sq.*

before the French occupation of the country, any page thus convicted of unchastity was executed on the spot. Every year the faithfulness of the king's wives was tested by a similar ordeal, and all who were found guilty were put to death.[1] Among the Eskimo, when a man has gone out to sea and has not returned in due time, a wizard will undertake to ascertain by means of the magic mirror whether the missing man is alive or dead. For this purpose he lifts up the head of the nearest relation of the missing man with a stick; a tub of water stands under, and in this mirror the wizard professes to behold the image of the absent mariner either overset in his canoe or sitting upright and rowing. Thus he is able either to comfort the anxious relatives with an assurance of the safety of their friend or to confirm their worst fears by the tidings of his death.[2]

Vision of gods in water revealed to dupes by ancient oracle-mongers.

An early Christian writer has let us into the secret of the tricks to which ancient oracle-mongers resorted for the purpose of gratifying their dupes with a vision of the gods in water. They had a closed chamber built, the roof of which was painted blue. In the middle of the floor they set a vessel full of water which, reflecting the blue roof, presented the appearance of the sky. The vessel was made of stone, but it had a glass bottom, and beneath it was an opening into a secret chamber under the floor, where the confederates of the prophet assembled and played the parts which he assigned to them immediately under the oracular chasm. Meantime the inquirers of the oracle, gazing into the water, beheld, as they thought, a miraculous vision, and accordingly believed implicitly all that the prophet told them.[3]

Other modes of divination by means of a vessel of water.

But the magic mirror is not the only form of divination in which the material instrument employed for the discovery of truth is a vessel of water. An Indian mode of detecting a thief is to inscribe the names of all the suspected persons on separate balls of paste or wax, and then to throw the balls into a vessel of water. It is believed that the ball which contains the name of the thief will float on the sur-

[1] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), pp. 570, 572.

[2] David Crantz, *History of Greenland* (London, 1767), i. 214.

[3] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium Haeresium*, iv. 35, pp. 100, 102, ed. L. Duncker et F. G. Schneidewin (Göttingen, 1859).

face, and that all the others will sink to the bottom.[1] In Europe young people used to resort to many forms of divination on Midsummer Eve in order to ascertain their fortune in love. Thus in Dorsetshire a girl on going to bed would write the letters of the alphabet on scraps of paper and drop them in a basin of water with the letters downwards; and next morning she would expect to find the first letter of her future husband's name turned up, but all the other letters still turned down.[2] In Shropshire a girl will sometimes write the initials of several young men of her acquaintance on bits of paper, wrap a little ball of bread in each paper, and put the small packets in a glass of water; the young man whose initials first rise to the surface will win her hand.[3]

Divination by the position or configuration of things dropped into water.

Sometimes the fates are ascertained by dropping substances of one kind or another in a vessel of water and judging of the issue by the position or configuration which the substance assumes in the water. Thus among the Bahima or Banyankole, a pastoral tribe of Central Africa, in the Uganda Protectorate, a medicine-man would sometimes take a pot of water and cast certain herbs into it, which caused a froth to rise; then he dropped four coffee-berries into the water, marked the positions which they took up, and inferred the wishes of the gods according to the direction in which the berries pointed or the side which they turned up in floating.[4] Among the Garos of Assam a priest will sometimes divine by means of a cup of water and some grains of uncooked rice. Holding the cup of water in his left hand, he drops the rice into it, grain by grain, calling out the name of a spirit as each grain falls. The spirit who chances to be named at the moment when two grains, floating in the water, collide with each other, is the one who must be propitiated.[5] In Scotland a tea-stalk floating on the surface of a tea-cup was supposed to betoken a stranger.

Divination by tea-leaves in a cup.

[1] James Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs* (London, 1813), ii. 245 *sq.*

[2] William Hone, *Year Book* (London, N.D.), col. 1176.

[3] Miss C. S. Burne and Miss G. F. Jackson, *Shropshire Folk-lore* (London, 1883), p. 179. It does not appear that this mode of divination is practised only on Midsummer Eve.

[4] John Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 135.

[5] Major A. Playfair, *The Garos* (London, 1909), p. 97.

"It was taken from the cup and tested with the teeth whether soft or hard. If soft, the stranger was a female; if hard, a male. It was then put on the back of the left hand and struck three times with the back of the right. The left hand was then held up and slightly shaken. If the tea-stalk fell off, the stranger was not to arrive; if it stuck, the stranger would arrive." [1] In the Highlands of Scotland the art of divining by the tea-leaves or sediment in a tea-cup was carried out in still greater detail. Even yet, we are told, young women resort in numbers to fortune-tellers of this class, who, for the simple reward of the tea, spell out to them most excellent matches. The prediction is made from the arrangement of the sediment or tea-leaves in the cup after the last of the liquid has been made to wash the sides of the cup in the *deiseal* or right-hand-turn direction and then poured out.[2] In England similar prophecies are hazarded from tea-leaves and coffee-grounds left at the bottom of cups.[3] So in Macedonia people divine by coffee. "One solitary bubble in the centre of the cup betokens that the person holding it possesses one staunch and faithful friend. If there are several bubbles forming a ring close to the edge of the cup, they signify that he is fickle in his affections, and that his heart is divided between several objects of worship. The grounds of coffee are likewise observed and variously explained according to the forms which they assume: if they spread round the cup in the shape of rivulets and streams money is prognosticated, and so forth." [4]

Divination by molten lead or wax in a vessel of water.

In Europe a favourite mode of divination is practised by pouring molten lead or wax into a vessel of water and watching the forms which the substance assumes as it cools in the water. This way of prying into the future has been resorted to in Lithuania, Sweden, Scotland, and Ireland.[5]

[1] Rev. Walter Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the North-East of Scotland* (London, 1881), pp. 31 *sq.*

[2] Rev. J. G. Campbell, *Superstitions of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1900), pp. 266 *sq.*

[3] John Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain* (London, 1882–1883), iii. 330.

[4] G. F. Abbott, *Macedonian Folk-lore* (Cambridge, 1903), p. 95.

[5] J. Lasicius, *De diis Samagitarum caeterorumque Sarmatarum*, reprinted in *Magazin herausgegeben von der Lettisch-Literärischen Gesellschaft*, xiv. Part i. (Mitau, 1868) p. 98; L. Lloyd, *Peasant Life in Sweden* (London, 1870), p. 187; J. G. Dalyell, *Darker Superstitions of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1834), pp. 511 *sq.*; A. C. Haddon, "A Batch of Irish Folk-lore," *Folk-lore*, iv. (1893) pp. 361 *sq.*

Again, in Ireland a certain disease called *esane* was supposed to be sent by the fairies, and in order to prognosticate its course or prescribe for its treatment diviners used to inspect coals which they had dropped into a pot of clean water.[1]

In one or other of these ways Joseph may be supposed to have divined by means of his silver cup.

[1] William Camden, *Britannia*, translated by Philemon Holland (London, 1610), "Ireland," p. 147. For other examples of divination by looking into water, see N. W. Thomas, *Crystal Gazing* (London, 1905), pp. 42 *sqq.*; Edward Clodd, *The Question* (London, 1917), pp. 155 *sqq.*

PART III

THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES AND THE KINGS

CHAPTER I

MOSES IN THE ARK OF BULRUSHES

WITH the life of Joseph the patriarchal age of Israel may be said to end. A brilliant series of biographical sketches, vivid in colouring and masterly in the delineation of character, has described the march of the patriarchs from the banks of the Euphrates to the banks of the Nile. There the historian leaves them for a time. The curtain descends on the first act of the drama, and when it rises again on the same scene, some four hundred years are supposed to have elapsed,[1] and the patriarchal family has expanded into a nation. From this point the national history begins, and the first commanding figure in it is that of Moses, the great leader and lawgiver, who is said to have delivered his people from bondage in Egypt, to have guided them in their wanderings across the Arabian desert, to have moulded their institutions, and finally to have died within sight of the Promised Land, which he was not to enter. There seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt that in these broad outlines the tradition concerning him is correct. In the story of his exploits, as in that of so many national heroes, later ages unquestionably embroidered the sober tissue of fact with the gay threads of fancy; yet the change thus wrought in the web has not been so great as to disguise the main strands beyond recognition. We can still trace the limbs of the man under the gorgeous drapery of

The patriarchal age ends with Joseph, and the national history of Israel begins with Moses.

[1] Four hundred years, according to Genesis xv. 13; four hundred and thirty years, according to Exodus xii. 40 *sq.* Either number creates a serious chronological difficulty when it is compared with the reckoning by generations. On this subject the commentators on Exodus, particularly Dillmann, Bennett, and Driver, may be consulted.

the magician who confronted Pharaoh and wrought plagues on all the land of Egypt; we can still perceive the human features through the nimbus of supernatural glory which shone on the features of the saint and prophet as he descended from the mountain, where he had conversed with God and had received from the divine hands a new code of law for his people. It is indeed remarkable that, though Moses stands so much nearer than the patriarchs to the border line of history, the element of the marvellous and the miraculous enters much more deeply into his story than into theirs. While from time to time they are said to have communed with the deity, either face to face or in visions, not one of them is represented as a worker of those signs and wonders which occur so frequently in the career of Moses. We see them moving as men among men, attending to the common business and sharing the common joys and sorrows of humanity. Moses, on the other hand, from the beginning to the end of his life is represented as set apart for a great mission and moving accordingly on a higher plane than ordinary mortals, with hardly any traces of those frailties which are incidental to all men, and which, touched in by a delicate brush, add so much life-like colour to the portraits of the patriarchs. That is why the simple humanity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob touches us all so much more nearly than the splendid but solitary figure of Moses.

The element of the marvellous in the story of Moses.

Like all the events of his life, the birth of Moses is encircled in tradition with a halo of romance. After the death of Joseph and his brethren, their descendants, the children of Israel, are said to have multiplied so fast in Egypt that the Egyptians viewed them with fear and distrust, and attempted to check their increase by putting them to hard service. When this harsh treatment failed to produce the desired effect, the king of Egypt issued orders that all male Hebrew children should be killed at birth, and when the cruel command was evaded by the humane subterfuge of the midwives who were charged to carry it out, he commanded all his people to fling every Hebrew man-child at birth into the river. Accordingly, on the birth of Moses, his mother hid him at first for three months, and

The birth and exposure of Moses and his fortunate preservation.

when she could hide him no longer she made an ark of bulrushes, or rather of papyrus, daubed it with slime and pitch, and put the child therein. Then she carried the ark out sadly and laid it in the flags by the river's brink. But the child's elder sister stood afar off to know what should become of her little brother. Now it chanced that the daughter of Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, came down to bathe at the river, and spying the ark among the flags she sent one of her maidens to fetch it. When the ark was brought and opened, the princess saw the child in it, and behold, the babe wept. So she had compassion on him and said, "This is one of the Hebrews' children." While she was looking at him, the child's sister, who had been watching and had seen all that had happened, came up and said to the princess, "Shall I go and call thee a nurse of the Hebrew women, that she may nurse the child for thee?" And Pharaoh's daughter said, "Go." And the maid went and called the child's mother. And Pharaoh's daughter said to her, "Take this child away, and nurse it for me, and I will give thee thy wages." So the mother took her child and nursed it. And the child grew, and she brought him to Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son. And she called his name Moses, "Because," she said, "I drew him out of the water."[1]

Similar stories told of the exposure and preservation of remarkable personages.

While this story of the birth and upbringing of Moses is free from all supernatural elements, it nevertheless presents features which may reasonably be suspected of belonging to the realm of folk-lore rather than of history. In order, apparently, to enhance the wonder of his hero's career, the story-teller loves to relate how the great man or woman was exposed at birth, and was only rescued from imminent death by what might seem to vulgar eyes an accident, but what really proved to be the finger of Fate interposed to preserve the helpless babe for the high destiny that awaited him or her. Such incidents are probably in most cases to be regarded as embellishments due to the invention of the narrator, picturesque touches added by him to heighten the effect of a plain tale which he deemed below the dignity of his subject.

[1] Exodus i., ii. 1-10.

Story of the exposure and preservation of Semiramis, queen of Assyria.

Thus, for example, the legendary Semiramis, queen of Assyria, is said to have been a daughter of the Syrian goddess Derceto by a mortal man. When the child was born, the goddess, ashamed of her slip, exposed the infant in a rocky place and left it to perish there of cold and hunger. But it so happened that a great multitude of doves had their nests on the spot, and they took pity on the forsaken babe. Some of them brooded over it and warmed its cold body with their soft plumage; others brought milk in their bills from a neighbouring herd of cows and dropped it into the infant's tender mouth. In time, as it grew stronger and needed more solid food, the doves attacked the cheeses in the dairy, and nibbling off morsels they brought them and so fed the child. But the herdsmen marked how their cheeses were nibbled by the doves, and following the birds in their flight they found the fair infant. So they took her up and brought her home, and presented her to the master of the king's herds, who, being childless, adopted her and reared her as his own. When she had grown to marriageable age and surpassed all the maidens of the land in beauty, it chanced that one of the king's officers was sent to inspect the royal herds, and he, seeing the lovely damsel Semiramis, fell in love with and married her. Afterwards she displayed so much military talent that she attracted the notice of Ninus himself, the king of Assyria, who, charmed alike by her beauty and her genius, obliged her husband by threats to take his own life, and then married the fair widow and made her his consort on the throne. Her name was supposed to be derived from a Syrian word for "dove," because doves had nursed her in infancy, and henceforth the birds were deemed sacred by all the Syrians.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Gilgamesh, or Gilgamus, king of Babylon.

A somewhat similar story was told of Gilgamesh or Gilgamus, as the Greeks called him, the legendary Babylonian hero, whose deeds and sufferings form the theme of the now famous epic named after him. It is said that in the reign of Seuechoras, king of Babylon, the Chaldeans predicted that the king's daughter would bear a son who should deprive his grandsire of the kingdom. Hence, in order to prevent her from fulfilling the prophecy, her royal father kept her

[1] Diodorus Siculus ii. 4.

straitly shut up in the citadel. But his precautions were vain. Love found a way through the bolts and bars, and the princess was discovered to be with child by a father unknown. Her guardians, dreading the king's anger at their lack of vigilance, cast the new-born babe from the parapet of the castle wall, thinking to dash it to pieces on the rocks below. But at that moment an eagle, which had been circling overhead, swooped down, intercepted the falling infant before it could reach the ground, and bearing it on its back, deposited it gently in a garden. The gardener beheld the handsome boy with admiration, took him home, and reared him as his own. The boy was Gilgamesh, and he lived to succeed his grandfather on the throne of Babylon.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Cyrus, king of Persia.

A real historical personage who is said to have been exposed in his infancy was Cyrus, the first king of Persia. His mother was Mandace, daughter of Astyages, the king of the Medes. Now it chanced that while Mandace was still a maid her royal father dreamed a dream, in which it seemed to him that a flood issued from his daughter's body and overwhelmed the whole of Asia. Alarmed at the portent, he consulted the Magians, whose business it was to interpret dreams. On their advice he gave his daughter in marriage to a Persian named Cambyses, a man of good family, but of a quiet, unambitious turn of mind. From such a union of his daughter with a man of a subject race (for the Persians acknowledged the sway of the Medes) the king thought that no danger could arise to his dynasty. Nevertheless, after Mandace was married to Cambyses, her royal father dreamed another dream, and behold he saw growing out of his daughter's body a vine which overshadowed the whole of Asia. The king again betook him to the interpreters of dreams, and asked them the meaning of the dream. It betokened, they said, that his daughter would give birth to a son who should reign in his stead. So the king kept his daughter, who was now with child, under watch and ward; and when her infant, the future Cyrus, was born, the king sent for his grand vizier, Harpagus by name, and charged him to take away the child and destroy it. His minister promised

The ominous dreams.

The king's command.

[1] Aelian, *De natura animalium*, xii. 21.

The minister's disobedience.

to obey, and taking up the babe, arrayed in fine clothes and golden jewellery, he carried it, weeping as he went, to his house. There he told his wife the secret, but fearing the future vengeance of the princess if he put her infant to death with his own hands, he resolved to turn over the office of executioner to one of the king's own servants. Accordingly he sent for one of the king's herdsmen, by name Mitradates, who fed his flocks on high and thickly wooded mountains, the haunt of wild beasts. Into his hands the grand vizier committed the royal babe, saying, "The king commands thee to leave this child to perish in the most solitary part of the mountains. But if thou shalt save it alive, surely the king will put thee to a most painful death. And when the child is exposed, I am ordered to go and see its dead body." So the herdsman took up the babe in his arms and carried it to his cottage among the hills. Now so it was that his wife had been with child, and in his absence she had been delivered, but the infant was still-born. And when her husband returned carrying a handsome baby boy, adorned with fine raiment and jewels of gold, her heart went out to it, and she entreated her husband to give her the live child, but to take her dead child, dress it in the clothes and trinkets of the royal infant, and to expose the little corpse, thus bedecked, in a lonely place among the mountains. "Thus," said she, "our own child will receive a royal funeral, and we shall save the life of the princely infant." The advice seemed good, and her husband followed it. So when their dead child, wrapt in regal finery, had lain stark and cold on the mountains for three days, the herdsman reported to the grand vizier that his commands had been obeyed, and the vizier sent some of his trustiest guards, and they brought him word of what they had seen, and how they had buried the infant. Thus the young prince Cyrus grew up in the wild mountains as the putative son of the king's herdsman. But when he was ten years old his masterful temperament betrayed his royal lineage. For it happened that one day his playfellows chose him to be their king, and in that capacity he issued his orders to them. But one of them, the son of a noble Mede, disobeyed him, so Cyrus ordered some of the other boys to hold him down, while he himself administered a sound whipping to the small rebel.

The herdsman's wife has compassion on the princely babe and saves its life.

The youthful prince reveals himself.

On being released, the young nobleman hastened home to the city, and there complained bitterly to his noble father of the treatment to which he, a boy of blue blood, had been subjected by the herdsman's son. His father shared his indignation, and hurrying to court laid the matter before King Astyages himself. The monarch sent for the herdsman and his reputed son, and from the lad's likeness to himself, and from the bold answers he gave to the king's questions, he began to suspect how the land lay. At first the herdsman attempted to deny the lad's real parentage, but the threat of torture extorted the truth from his reluctant lips. The murder, or rather the failure of the murder, was now out; and the king had to decide what to do with his grandson, thus unexpectedly restored to life. The interpreters of dreams were again sent for, and, on weighing the whole matter in the balance of their science, they pronounced that the king's dreams had been fulfilled by the kingly title which had been bestowed on his youthful grandson by his playfellows, and by the kingly power which he had exercised over them; he had reigned once, and could not reign a second time, so his grandfather need not fear to be ousted by him from the throne. The verdict of the sages apparently chimed in with the old king's own inclination, for he acquiesced in it and sent the boy away to live with his true parents, Cambyses and Mandace, among the Persians. But on the grand vizier Harpagus, who had disobeyed him, the king took a cruel revenge; for he caused the vizier's only son to be murdered, and his flesh to be cooked and served up to his unwitting father at a banquet. When the father learned "what wild beast's flesh he had partaken of," as the tyrant put it grimly to him, all that the accomplished courtier said in reply was, "The king's will be done."[1]

The prince's parentage discovered.

The king's revenge.

Such is the story of the birth and upbringing of Cyrus as it is related by Herodotus. But the father of history appears to have omitted a not unimportant feature of the legend, which has been preserved by a much later historian. According to Justin, the infant Cyrus was actually exposed by the herdsman, but afterwards rescued by him at the entreaty of his wife. When he went to recover the forsaken

Another story how the infant Cyrus was suckled by a bitch.

[1] Herodotus i. 107-122.

babe in the forest, he found a bitch in the act of suckling the infant and protecting it from the attacks of wild beasts and birds; and when he took up the child in his arms and carried it home, the bitch trotted anxiously at his heels. Hence the herdsman's wife, who nursed the youthful Cyrus, received the name of Spaco, which in the Persian language meant a bitch.[1] As Herodotus also tells us that the woman's name was Spaco, which in the Median tongue signified a bitch,[2] we may infer with some probability that he knew but disbelieved the story of the suckling of Cyrus by a bitch, accounting for its origin in a euhemeristic fashion through the name of the child's nurse.

Story of the exposure and preservation of Perseus, king of Argos.

In Greek legend the incident of the hero exposed in infancy and wonderfully preserved for future greatness occurs repeatedly. Thus Acrisius, king of Argos, had a daughter Danae, but no son, and when he inquired of the Delphic oracle how he should obtain male offspring, he was answered that his daughter would give birth to a son who should kill him. To guard against this catastrophe the king caused his daughter to be shut up in a brazen underground chamber, that no man might come at her. But Zeus, in the form of a shower of gold, contrived to make his way through the roof into the maiden's cell, and she became the mother of Perseus by the god. In vain did the mother protest her innocence and tell the true story of the infant's miraculous birth; her father, a shallow sceptic, refused to believe in the divine parentage, and obstinately persisted in asserting, in coarse and vulgar language, that his daughter was no better than she should be. The painful altercation ended in the king's peremptorily ordering the hussy and her brat to be shut up in a chest and thrown into the sea. The stern command was obeyed. The chest with its living freight drifted to the island of Seriphus, where it was caught and drawn ashore by a fisherman in his net. On opening the chest and beholding the mother and her child, he was touched with compassion, took them to his home, and brought up the boy, who received the name of Perseus, and, after performing many

[1] Justin i. 4.

[2] Herodotus i. 110. "A root *spak* or *svak* is common for 'dog' in the Indo-European languages. It occurs in Sanscrit and Zend, in Russian under the form of *sabac*, and in some parts of modern Persia as *aspaka*." (G. Rawlinson's note on Herodotus, *l.c.*)

marvellous deeds, fulfilled the oracle by accidentally killing his grandsire Acrisius with a quoit, and so succeeded to his kingdom.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Telephus, king of Mysia.

A like tale was told of another Greek hero, Telephus. It is said that when Hercules was journeying through Arcadia he lodged with Aleus, king of Tegea, and made an ill return for the hospitality which he received by debauching the king's daughter Auge, and she bore him a son. Taxed by her angry father with the loss of her honour, the damsel stoutly maintained that the father of her child was no other than Hercules. As usual, the stern parent refused to believe the true but wondrous tale, which he treated as a cock and bull story vamped up by a guilty woman to cloak her sin. So he ordered his friend Nauplius to put the mother and her child into a chest and cast them into the sea. But the chest drifted to the mouth of the Caicus river in Mysia, where it was found by Teuthras, king of the country, who married Auge and brought up her son Telephus as his own.[2] According to another account, when Auge had given birth to her son, she hid him on Mount Parthenius, that is, the Maiden's Mount, where a doe found and suckled the forsaken infant. There, too, the shepherds of King Corythus found him and brought him to their master, who adopted him and called him Telephus, because he had been suckled by a doe. When Telephus grew to manhood he repaired to Delphi and inquired of the oracle after his mother. The god directed him to go to Mysia, where he discovered his mother Auge wedded to King Teuthras. Having no male offspring, the king gave Telephus his daughter to wife and appointed him heir to the throne.[3] The suckling of Telephus by the doe was a favourite subject of ancient artists; it was represented, for example, by a statue in the grove of the Muses on Mount Helicon,[4] and it was particularly popular at Pergamus in Mysia, where Telephus was a national hero. Hence the scene of his nurture by the doe figures on coins of the city,

[1] Pherecydes, quoted by the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*, iv. 1091; Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, ii. 4. Horace converted the bronze dungeon into a bronze tower (*Odes*, iii. 16. 1).

[2] Strabo xiii. 1. 69.

[3] Diodorus Siculus iv. 33; Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, ii. 7. 4, iii. 9. 1; Pausanias viii. 48. 7, viii. 54. 6; J. Tzetzes, *Scholia on Lycophron*, 206; Hyginus, *Fab.* 99 *sq.*

[4] Pausanias ix. 31. 2.

and the same theme recurs in the series of reliefs which adorned the great altar on the acropolis, though here the animal which suckled the infant appears to be represented as a lioness rather than a doe.[1] Aegisthus, the murderer of Agamemnon, is said to have been the fruit of incestuous intercourse between his mother Pelopia and her father Thyestes; when he was born his mother exposed him, but shepherds found the child and gave him to a she-goat to suckle.[2]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Aegisthus.

Another hero of Greek legend who was said to have been exposed in his youth was Oedipus. His father Laius, king of Thebes, had been warned by the Delphic oracle that his wife Jocasta would bear him a son who would slay his father. Hence the king avoided consorting with his queen, until one fatal night, heated with wine, he forgot his caution and admitted her to his bed. She bore him a son, but within three days of his birth, to frustrate the decree of fate, she pierced and fastened the infant's ankles together with bodkins, and gave him to a shepherd to expose on the heights of Mount Cithaeron. But unwilling to leave the royal infant to perish, the herdsman passed him on to another shepherd, the servant of Polybus, king of Corinth, who drove his master's flocks every summer to the high upland pastures among the pinewoods of Cithaeron, to escape the parching heat and the withered grass of the Corinthian plains. In his turn the Corinthian shepherd bore the child to his royal mistress the queen of Corinth, who, having no son of her own, adopted the foundling and passed him off as her own offspring, giving him the name of Oedipus, or "swollen-foot," because of his ankles pierced and swollen by the bodkins. Thus Oedipus was brought up at a foreign court as the son of the king of Corinth, and lived to fulfil the oracle by slaying his true father Laius, king of Thebes, whom he encountered accidentally driving his chariot in a narrow pass of the Phocian mountains. Afterwards, by reading the riddle of the Sphinx, he succeeded to his paternal kingdom of Thebes, and married the late king's widow, his

Story of the exposure and preservation of Oedipus, king of Thebes.

[1] Otto Jahn, *Archäologische Aufsätze* (Greisswald, 1845), pp. 160 *sqq.*; A. Baumeister, *Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums* (Munich and Leipsic, 1885–1888), ii. 1270, with fig. 1428.

[2] Hyginus, *Fab.* 87, 88, 252.

own mother Jocasta, thus accomplishing another prediction of the Delphic Apollo.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Romulus, king of Rome.

According to Roman tradition, the founder of Rome himself was exposed in his infancy and might have perished, if it had not been for the providential interposition of a she-wolf and a woodpecker. The story ran thus. On the slope of the Alban Mountains stood the long white city of Alba Longa, and a dynasty of kings named the Sylvii or the Woods reigned over it, while as yet shepherds fed their flocks on the hills of Rome, and wolves prowled in the marshy hollows between them. It so chanced that one of the kings of Alba, by name Proca, left two sons, Numitor and Amulius, of whom Numitor was the elder and was destined by his father to succeed him on the throne. But his younger brother, ambitious and unscrupulous, contrived to oust his elder brother by violence and to reign in his stead. Not content with that, he plotted to secure his usurped power by depriving his injured brother of an heir. For that purpose he caused the only son of Numitor to be murdered, and he persuaded or compelled his brother's daughter, Rhea Silvia by name, to dedicate herself to the worship of Vesta and thereby to take the vow of perpetual virginity. But the vow was broken. The Vestal virgin was found to be with child, and in due time she gave birth to twin boys. She fathered them on the god Mars, but her hard-hearted uncle refused to admit the plea, and ordered the two babes to be thrown into the river. It happened that the Tiber had overflowed its banks, and the servants who were charged with the task of drowning the infants, unable to approach the main stream, were obliged to deposit the ark containing the children in shoal water at the foot of the Palatine hill. There they abandoned the babes to their fate, and there a she-wolf, attracted by their cries, found and suckled them and licked their bodies clean of the slime with which they were covered. Down to imperial times the bronze statue of a wolf suckling two infants stood on the spot to commemorate the tradition, and the statue is still preserved in the Capitoline Museum

The virgin mother and the divine father.

The exposure of the twins Romulus and Remus and the suckling of them by a wolf.

[1] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, iii. 5. 7 *sq.*; Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, 711 *sqq.*, 994 *sqq.*, 1123 *sqq.*

at Rome. Some said that a woodpecker assisted the wolf in feeding and guarding the forsaken twins; and as both the wolf and the woodpecker were creatures sacred to Mars, people drew from this circumstance a fresh argument in favour of the divine parentage of Romulus and Remus. Be that as it may, the children thus miraculously preserved were found by one of the king's shepherds, named Faustulus, who took them home and gave them to his wife Acca Larentia to rear. As the boys grew up to manhood they gave proof of their noble birth by their courage and valour; for not content with tending the flocks of their putative father, they hunted the wild beasts in the woods, and attacking the robbers who infested the country they stripped them of their ill-gotten gains and divided the booty among the shepherds. In this way they gathered about them a troop of followers and adherents, but incurred the enmity of the freebooters. The very hut in which Romulus dwelt as a shepherd among shepherds was shown at Rome down to the reign of Augustus; it stood on the side of the Palatine Hill facing towards the Circus Maximus; it was built of wood and reeds, and the inevitable dilapidations wrought by time and the weather were carefully repaired in order to preserve this venerable monument of antiquity for the edification of a remote posterity. The sight of the lowly hut, overshadowed by the marble palaces of the Caesars, was well fitted to minister to Roman pride by reminding the passers-by from what humble beginnings Rome had advanced to the dominion of the world. But the shepherds of King Amulius on the Palatine Hill had neighbours and rivals in the shepherds of his brother Numitor, who fed their flocks on the opposite Aventine Hill. Disputes as to the right of pasture led to brawls and even to fights between the herdsmen of the two princes. On one occasion, when the herdsmen of King Amulius were celebrating the quaint rites of the Lupercal, at which they ran naked except for a girdle made out of the skins of the sacrificed goats, their rivals lay in wait for them, and succeeded in capturing Remus and other prisoners, while Romulus cut his way through them by force of arms and escaped. Some, however, said that the capture was effected by robbers, who thus avenged them-

The hut of Romulus on the Palatine Hill.

selves for the losses of booty which they had sustained at the hands of the two valiant brothers. However that may have been, the captive Remus was brought before his master King Amulius and charged with having encroached on the pastures belonging to Numitor. The king handed over the accused to his brother Numitor, as the injured party, to be by him examined and punished. On questioning the supposed culprit, Numitor learned the circumstances of the exposure and upbringing of the twins, and by comparing their age with that which his grandchildren would have reached if they had been suffered to live, and by observing the handsome figure and princely bearing of the captive, he began to suspect the truth. Meantime Faustulus, the foster-father of the twins, had revealed the secret of their noble birth and parentage to Romulus, and, fired by the prospect thus opened up to his aspiring temperament, the young prince collected a band of comrades and hastened to the rescue of his brother. Arrived at the capital he first repaired to the house of his grandfather Numitor, to whom he made himself known, and after a joyful recognition on both sides the two young men led their tumultuary force, swelled by the armed retainers of their grandfather, to the king's palace, and forcing the entrance slew the usurper in his den. After that they restored the kingdom to the lawful monarch, their grandfather Numitor, and returning to the scene which was endeared to them by all the memories of their youth, they founded the city of Rome on the pastoral hills by the Tiber, intending to reign over it jointly as its first kings. Some people sought to eliminate at least one miraculous element from the legend by explaining away the story of the suckling of the twins by the she-wolf. According to them, the fable arose through a simple misunderstanding of the name wolf (*lupa*), which in the Latin language denoted a strumpet as well as the animal, and was appropriately applied to Acca Larentia, the nurse of the twins, who had been a woman of loose life.[1]

The recognition of the twins by their grandfather.

[1] Livy i. 3-6; Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 381 *sqq.*; Plutarch, *Romulus*, 3-9; Dionysius Halicarnasensis, *Antiquit. Roman.* i. 76-85. Plutarch is the only one of these writers who mentions the share of the woodpecker in the nurture of the twins. As to the Capitoline statue of the wolf suckling the twins, see W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*[2] (Leipsic, 1899), i. 429 *sqq.* No. 638.

Thus in the case of the first king of Rome, as in that of the first king of Persia, ancient rationalism attempted to reduce myth to history by the simple expedient of converting the name of an animal into the name of a woman who nursed the hero in his infancy. The founder of the Turkish nation is similarly said to have been exposed in his childhood and saved and nourished by a she-wolf, which he afterwards married.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Sargon, king of Babylonia.

Such marvellous tales appear to have been told particularly of the founders of dynasties or of kingdoms, whose parentage and upbringing were forgotten, the blank thus left by memory being supplied by the fancy of the story-teller. Oriental history furnishes yet another instance of a similar glamour thrown over the dark beginning of a powerful empire. The first Semitic king to reign over Babylonia was Sargon the Elder, who lived about 2600 B.C. A redoubtable conqueror and an active builder, he made a great name for himself, yet apparently he did not know the name of his own father. At least we gather as much from an inscription which is said to have been carved on one of his statues; a copy of the inscription was made in the eighth century before our era and deposited in the royal library at Nineveh, where it was discovered in modern times. In this document the king sets forth his own early history as follows:—

"*Sargon, the mighty king, the king of Agade, am I,*
My mother was lowly, my father I knew not,
And the brother of my father dwells in the mountain.
My city is Azuripanu, which lies on the bank of the Euphrates.
My lowly mother conceived me, in secret she brought me forth.
She set me in a basket of rushes, with bitumen she closed my door;
She cast me into the river, which rose not over me.
The river bore me up, unto Akki, the irrigator, it carried me.
Akki, the irrigator, with . . . lifted me out,
Akki, the irrigator, as his own son . . . reared me,
Akki, the irrigator, as his gardener appointed me.
While I was a gardener, the goddess Ishtar loved me,
And for . . . four years I ruled the kingdom.
The black-headed peoples *I ruled, I* governed."[2]

[1] Stanislas Julien, *Documents historiques sur les Tou-kioue (Turcs), traduits du chinois* (Paris, 1877), pp. 2 *sq.*, 25 *sq.*

[2] R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (Oxford University Press, N.D.), pp. 135 *sq.* Compare R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and*

This story of the exposure of the infant Sargon in a basket of rushes on the river closely resembles the story of the exposure of the infant Moses among the flags of the Nile,[1] and as it is to all appearance very much older than the Hebrew tradition, the authors of Exodus may perhaps have been acquainted with it and may have modelled their narrative of the episode on the Babylonian original. But it is equally possible that the Babylonian and the Hebrew tales are independent offshoots from the common root of popular imagination. In the absence of evidence pointing conclusively in the one direction or the other, dogmatism on the question would be out of place.

Story in the *Mahabharata* of the exposure and preservation of Prince Karna.

The theory of the independent origin of the Babylonian and Hebrew stories is to some extent confirmed by the occurrence of a parallel legend in the great Indian epic the *Mahabharata*, since it is hardly likely that the authors of that work had any acquaintance with Semitic traditions. The poet relates how the king's daughter Kunti or Pritha was beloved by the Sun-god and bore him a son "beautiful as a celestial," "clad in armour, adorned with brilliant golden ear-rings, endued with leonine eyes and bovine shoulders." But ashamed of her frailty, and dreading the anger of her royal father and mother, the princess, "in consultation with her nurse, placed her child in a waterproof basket, covered all over with sheets, made of wicker-work, smooth, comfortable and furnished with a beautiful pillow. And with tearful eyes she consigned it to (the waters of) the river Asva." Having done so, she returned to the palace, heavy at heart, lest her angry sire should learn her secret. But the basket containing the babe floated down the river till it came to the Ganges and was washed ashore at the city of Champa in the Suta territory. There it chanced that a man of the Suta tribe and his wife, walking on the bank of the river,

Babylonian Literature (New York, 1901), p. 1; Alfred Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*[2] (Leipsic, 1906), pp. 410 *sq.*; H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder* (Tübingen, 1909), i. 79; (Sir) G. Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient Classique, Les Origines* (Paris, 1895), pp. 596 *sqq.*

[1] The story of the exposure of Moses has been compared to certain stories told by the Tonga-speaking tribes of North-Western Rhodesia, but the resemblance seems too slight to warrant any inference from it. See J. Torrend, S.J., "Likenesses of Moses' Story in the Central Africa Folk-lore," *Anthropos*, v. (1910) pp. 54-70.

saw the basket, drew it from the water, and on opening it beheld a baby boy "(beautiful) as the morning sun, clad in a golden armour, and with a beautiful face adorned with brilliant ear-rings." Now the pair were childless, and when the man looked upon the fair infant, he said to his wife, "Surely, considering that I have no son, the gods have sent this child to me." So they adopted him, and brought him up, and he became a mighty archer, and his name was Karna. But his royal mother had news of him through her spies.[1]

Story of the exposure and preservation of Trakhan, king of Gilgit.

A similar story is told of the exposure and upbringing of Trakhan, king of Gilgit, a town situated at a height of about five thousand feet above the sea in the very heart of the snowy Himalayas. Enjoying a fine climate, a central position, and a considerable stretch of fertile land, Gilgit seems to have been from ancient times the seat of a succession of rulers, who bore more or less undisputed sway over the neighbouring valleys and states. Among them Trakhan, who reigned about the beginning of the thirteenth century, was particularly famous.[2] He is said to have been the strongest and the proudest king of Gilgit, and tradition still busies itself with his fortunes and doings. The story of his birth and exposure runs thus. His father Tra-Trakhan, king of Gilgit, had married a woman of a wealthy family at Darel. Being passionately devoted to polo, the king was in the habit of going over to Darel every week to play his favourite game with the seven brothers of his wife. One day, so keen were they all on the sport, they agreed to play on condition that the winner should put the losers to death. The contest was long and skilful, but at last the king won the match, and agreeably to the compact he, like a true sportsman, put his seven brothers-in-law to death. When he came home, no doubt in high spirits, and told the queen the result of the match, with its painful but necessary sequel, she was so far from sharing in his glee that she actually resented

[1] *The Mahabharata*, translated literally from the original Sanskrit text, edited by Manmatha Nath Dutt, iii. *Vana Parva* (Calcutta, 1896), pp. 436-440. The Indian and Babylonian parallels have already been indicated by the late learned scholar T. K. Cheyne (*Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, London, 1907, pp. 519 *sq.*).

[2] Major J. Biddulph, *Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh* (Calcutta, 1880), pp. 19-21.

the murder, or rather the execution, of her seven brothers and resolved to avenge it. So she put arsenic in the king's food, which soon laid him out, and the queen reigned in his stead. Now so it was that, at the time when she took this strong step, she was with child by the king, and about a month afterwards she gave birth to a son and called his name Trakhan. But so deeply did she mourn the death of her brothers, that she could not bear to look on the child of their murderer; hence she locked the infant in a wooden box and secretly threw it into the river. The current swept the box down the river as far as Hodar, a village in the Chilas District. Now it chanced that, as it floated by, two poor brothers were gathering sticks on the bank; and, thinking that the chest might contain treasure, one of them plunged into the water and drew it ashore. In order not to excite the covetousness of others by a display of the expected treasure, they hid the chest in a bundle of faggots and carried it home. There they opened it, and what was their surprise to discover in it a lovely babe still alive. Their mother brought up the little foundling with every care; and it seemed as if the infant brought a blessing to the house, for whereas they had been poor before, they now grew richer and richer, and set down their prosperity to the windfall of the child in the chest. When the boy was twelve years old, he conceived a great longing to go to Gilgit, of which he had heard much. So he went with his two foster-brothers, but on the way they stayed for a few days at a place called Baldas on the top of a hill. Now his mother was still queen of Gilgit, but she had fallen very ill, and as there was none to succeed her in Gilgit the people were searching for a king to come from elsewhere and reign over them. One morning, while things were in this state and all minds were in suspense, it chanced that the village cocks crew, but instead of saying as usual "Cock-a-doodle-do" they said "*Beldas tham bayi*," which being interpreted means, "There is a king at Baldas." So men were at once sent to bring down any stranger they might find there. The messengers found the three brothers and brought them before the queen. As Trakhan was handsome and stately, the queen addressed herself to him, and in course of conversation elicited from him his story.

To her surprise and joy she learned that this goodly boy was her own lost son, whom on a rash impulse of grief and resentment she had cast into the river. So she embraced him and proclaimed him the rightful heir to the kingdom of Gilgit.[1]

Stories of the exposure of infants on water may contain a reminiscence of a water ordeal to test their legitimacy.

It has been conjectured that in stories like that of the exposure of the infant Moses on the water we have a reminiscence of an old custom of testing the legitimacy of children by throwing them into the water and leaving them to swim or sink, the infants which swam being accepted as legitimate and those which sank being rejected as bastards.[2] In the light of this conjecture it may be significant that in several of these stories the birth of the child is represented as supernatural, which in this connexion cynics are apt to regard as a delicate synonym for illegitimate. Thus in Greek legend the child Perseus and the child Telephus were fathered upon the god Zeus and the hero Hercules respectively; in Roman legend the twins Romulus and Remus were gotten on their virgin mother by the god Mars; and in the Indian epic the princess ascribed the birth of her infant to the embrace of the Sun-god. In the Babylonian story, on the other hand, King Sargon, less fortunate or more honest than his Greek, Roman, and Indian compeers, frankly confessed that his father was unknown. The Biblical narrative of the birth of Moses drops no hint that his legitimacy was doubtful; but when we remember that his father Amram married his paternal aunt, that Moses was the offspring of the marriage,[3] and that later Jewish law condemned all such marriages as incestuous,[4] we may perhaps, without being uncharitable, suspect that in the original form of the story the mother of Moses had a more particular reason for exposing her babe on the water than a general command of Pharaoh to cast all male children of the Hebrews into the river.[5] Be that as it may, it appears that the water ordeal has been resorted to by peoples far apart for the purpose of

[1] Ghulam Muhammad, "Festivals and Folklore of Gilgit," *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. i. No. 7 (Calcutta, 1905), pp. 124 *sq.*

[2] R. Cirilli, "Le Jugement du Rhin et la légitimation des enfants par ordalie," *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, VI. Série, iii. (1912) pp. 80-88.

[3] Exodus vi. 20; compare Numbers xxvi. 59.

[4] Leviticus xviii. 12.

[5] Exodus i. 22.

deciding whether an infant is legitimate or not, and therefore whether it is to be saved or destroyed. Thus the Celts are said to have submitted the question of the legitimacy of their offspring to the judgment of the Rhine; they threw the infants into the water, and if the babes were bastards the pure and stern river drowned them, but if they were true-born, it graciously bore them up on its surface and wafted them gently ashore to the arms of their trembling mothers.[1] Similarly in Central Africa the explorer Speke was told "about Ururi, a province of Unyoro, under the jurisdiction of Kiméziri, a noted governor, who covers his children with bead ornaments, and throws them into the N'yanza, to prove their identity as his own true offspring; for should they sink, it stands to reason some other person must be their father; but should they float, then he recovers them."[2]

Water ordeal undergone by infants among the Celts and the Banyoro.

[1] Julian, *Orat.* ii. and *Epist.* xvi. pp. 104 *sq.*, 495, ed. F. C. Hertlein (Leipsic, 1875–1876); Libanius, *Orat.* xii. 48, vol. ii. p. 26, ed. R. Foerster (Leipsic, 1905); Nonnus, *Dionys.* xxiii. 94-96, xlvi. 57-60, pp. 196, 382, ed. le Comte de Marcellus (Paris, 1856); Claudian, *In Rufinum*, ii. 112; Eustathius, *Commentary on Dionysius*, *v.* 294 (in *Geographi Graeci Minores*, ed. C. Müller, Paris, 1882, vol. ii. pp. 267 *sq.*).

[2] John Hanning Speke, *Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile* (London, 1912), ch. xix. p. 444 (*Everyman's Library*).

CHAPTER II

THE PASSAGE THROUGH THE RED SEA

The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea.

FINDING the children of Israel useful in the capacity of bondsmen, Pharaoh long refused to let them depart; but at last his resolution was broken by a series of plagues and calamities which Moses, the great champion of Israel, called down with the divine assistance on the land and people of Egypt. So, turning their backs gladly on the country where they had endured oppression for so many years, the Israelites marched eastwards towards the Red Sea. But hardly were they gone when Pharaoh repented of having let them go, and pursued after them with a mighty host of chariots and horsemen to drag them back to the bondage from which they had just escaped. He came up with the long train of fugitives on the shore of the Red Sea. The Israelites were in a perilous situation. Behind them was the enemy and in front was the sea. Which way were they to turn? A contest between the helpless and unarmed multitude on the one side and the disciplined army on the other could only end in a massacre, and to plunge into the waves appeared to be certain death. However, Moses did not hesitate. At the bidding of God he stretched out his hand over the sea, and the waters parted, leaving a broad highway in their midst, on which the children of Israel marched dryshod to the farther shore, the billows standing as it were petrified into walls of translucent blue crystal on the right hand and on the left. The Egyptians followed them along the lane of yellow sand; but when the Israelites had reached the other bank, and their enemies were yet in the midst of the waters, Moses stretched out his hand once more over the

sea, and at once the blue walls broke into sheets of curling foam, which rushing together with a thunderous roar overwhelmed the Egyptians beneath the waves; men and horses and chariots all sank like stones into the depths, not one of them escaped. Thus did the Lord deliver the Israelites and smite their enemies.[1]

The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea compared with the passage of Alexander the Great and his army through the Pamphylian Sea.

In this narrative critics have long laboured to sift the miraculous from the historical element, for that a kernel of fact underlies the husk of fiction it would be rash to deny. There is the less reason to doubt the passage of the Israelites through an arm of the Red Sea because there are well-authenticated instances of similar passages over which later generations have thrown a similar veil of mystery and romance. After narrating the march of his people through the Red Sea, which according to him opened a way for them miraculously on being struck by the rod of Moses, the Jewish historian Josephus compared an incident in the history of Alexander the Great. When it was God's will, he tells us, that the Persian Empire should fall before the invader, the Pamphylian Sea drew back and allowed Alexander and his host to march through its bed.[2] Nor was the Jewish historian singular in his opinion of the miraculous interposition of the divinity in favour of the Macedonian conqueror. Many Greek historians shared his view, and the Greek comic poet Menander alluded to the passage of Alexander through the sea in terms which a Jew might have applied to the passage of Israel through the Red Sea.[3] It is true that Arrian, the historian of Alexander the Great, so far diminishes the marvel as to explain the drying up of the sea by a sudden change of wind from south to north, but this change of wind itself he attributes to an act of Providence.[4] Now if we had only these vague reports of Alexander's exploit to go upon, they might have been dis-

[1] Exodus xiii. 17–xv. 21. The narrative is believed by the critics to be a compound of elements drawn from the Jehovistic, Elohistic, and Priestly documents, as to which see above, vol. i. pp. 131 *sqq.* The Jehovistic writer attempts to rationalize the miracle by the help of a strong east wind which drove the sea back and allowed the Israelites to cross the dry bed in safety (chapter xiv. 21).

[2] Josephus, *Antiquit. Jud.* ii. 16. 5.

[3] Plutarch, *Alexander*, 17. Compare Appian, *Civil Wars*, ii. 149, where the passage of Alexander through the sea is spoken of as if it were miraculous (*διέτρεχε δαιμονίως*).

[4] Arrian, *Anabasis*, i. 26. 1.

missed by a sceptical historian as purely fabulous. Nevertheless we know from more sober and precise narratives that, stripped of the supernatural halo with which the lovers of the marvellous invested it, the feat was really performed. What happened was this. On his expedition against Darius and his host, Alexander had arrived with his army at Phaselis in Lycia. Here he had the choice of two routes by which to pursue his march eastward. Immediately to the north of the city the mountains, a branch of the great Taurus range, descended steeply to the sea, leaving at their foot a narrow strip of beach which, in calm weather or with a north wind blowing, was bare and passable by travellers, but which, with a south wind driving the waves on the shore, was deep under water. This was the direct road to Pamphylia. Another road lay through the mountains, but it was long, circuitous, and so steep that it went by the name of the Ladder. Alexander resolved to divide his forces, and sending a portion of them by the long road over the mountains he proceeded himself with a detachment by the shore road. The decision was a bold one, for it chanced that the weather was stormy, and the waves, sweeping over the narrow beach, broke in foam against the foot of the cliffs. All day long the soldiers waded through the water up to their waists, but at evening they emerged, dripping and weary, on dry land at the farther end of the pass.[1] Such was the exploit which rumour exaggerated into a passage like that of Moses and the Israelites through the Red Sea. In his own letters the conqueror mentioned his march along the beach without, apparently, making any allusion to the dangers and difficulties by which it had been beset;[2] and a late historian affirms that the wind, providentially veering from south to north, rendered the march along the beach easy and rapid.[3] Yet it is difficult to suppose that in Alexander's adventurous career this particular feat should have attained so high a degree of renown if it had not been attended by an unusual measure of hardship and peril. We may acquiesce then in the romantic, yet probably true, tale of the hero and his

[1] Strabo xiv. 3. 9, pp. 666 *sq.*, ed. Casaubon; Arrian, *Anabasis*, i. 26.

[2] Plutarch, *Alexander*, 17.

[3] Arrian, *Anabasis*, i. 26, ἐκ νότων σκληρῶν βορείαι ἐπιπνεύσαντες, οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ θείου, . . . εὐμαρῆ καὶ ταχεῖαν τὴν πάροδον παρέσχον.

soldiers wading waist-deep all day through the water, with an angry sea on the one side and the frowning cliffs above them on the other.

Passage of a Roman storming-party through the sea at the siege of New Carthage.

With this daring deed of the Macedonian king may be compared an exploit of the Romans in the second Carthaginian war. The centre of the Carthaginian power in Spain was the city of New Carthage, situated on a nearly land-locked bay and naturally defended by the sea on two sides and by a lagoon on the third. On his arrival in Spain as commander-in-chief of the Roman armies, Scipio the Elder resolved to take the enemy's capital by storm, but before delivering the assault he carefully reconnoitred the situation of the city. The lagoon, which protected it on the west, was connected with the sea by an artificial channel, through which the tide flowed and ebbed daily. From fishermen the Roman general learned that the lagoon was fordable at ebb-tide, being no deeper than a man's waist in some places and his knees in others. Having ascertained this, he laid his plans accordingly, and in a speech to the army publicly announced that the sea-god Neptune had appeared to him in a dream and promised to lend him such assistance in the attack as should be manifest to the whole army. The announcement, accompanied by a seasonable offer of golden crowns to those who should be the first to mount the walls, was received by the army with enthusiasm. Next morning, therefore, the storming parties, preceded by men with ladders, advanced with great spirit against the walls, the trumpets sounding the charge. The ladders were planted, the Romans swarmed up them, and engaged in hand-to-hand conflict with the defenders on the battlements. But though the assault was pressed with great gallantry, it failed. The ladders were overturned and the assailants overwhelmed under showers of beams and missiles of all kinds hurled on them from the top of the wall. So the Roman trumpets sounded the retire, and the survivors fell sullenly back. By this time the day was wearing on to noon, the hour when, as Scipio had learned from the fishermen, the tide would begin to ebb in the lagoon. In anticipation of the moment he stationed five hundred men with ladders on the edge of the lagoon, and ordered fresh troops, provided with more ladders than

Scipio's promise of the help of the sea-god Neptune in the attack.

before, to renew the attack on the land side. Again, the trumpets sounded the charge, again the Romans advanced, planted the ladders, and swarmed up them. And now, while the whole attention of the besieged was engaged in repelling this fresh assault, the tide in the lagoon began to ebb, and, reinforced by a strong north wind, was soon running like a mill-race through the channel out to sea. Scipio gave the word: the five hundred men, preceded by the guides, plunged boldly into the flood, and struggled, splashing and floundering, through the water to the farther shore. The rest of the army watched their advance with enthusiasm, remembering the promise of Neptune to their general, and believing that the sea-god himself was opening a passage through the deep for the Roman arms and leading the storming-party in person. Fired with this belief they locked their shields together and rushed at the gates to hew them down with axes and cleavers. Meantime the five hundred had made their way through the lagoon to dry land, planted their ladders, and climbed the walls, which they found deserted, all the defenders being engaged in repelling the attack elsewhere. So, advancing unresisted through the streets, they opened the gates to their comrades, who were battering them from without. Thus the assailants obtained possession of the city, and the resistance of the defenders soon turned into a massacre.[1]

Belief of the Roman soldiers in the divine interposition of the sea-god.

This account of the Roman capture of New Carthage is mainly derived from Polybius, a careful and accurate historian, who, as a friend of Scipio the Younger, had the best means of ascertaining the truth. From it we gather that the Roman soldiers, who saw their comrades wading through the lagoon, verily believed that the sea-god was indeed opening a way for them through the water, and if any sceptic had ventured to doubt the divine interposition in the matter, they would probably have answered that they preferred to trust the evidence of their own eyes. Indeed, we may suspect that

[1] Polybius x. 9-15; Livy xxvi. 42-46; Appian, *Hispan.* 19-22. As for the assistance supposed to be given by Neptune, see in particular Livy xxvi. 45, "*Hoc cura ac ratione compertum in prodigium ac deos vertens Scipio, qui ad transitum Romanis mare verterent et stagna auferrent viasque ante nunquam initas humano vestigio aperirent, Neptunum jubebat ducem itineris sequi ac medio stagno evadere ad moenia.*"

Scipio himself was secretly more than half convinced of the help which he publicly professed to have received from the deity, and that as years went on this conviction was deepened by the unbroken success which attended his undertakings. Through his eminently practical nature, as through that of many men of action who have been great and fortunate, there ran a vein of mysticism, and in later life he would sometimes retire into the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, and shutting the door remain closeted for some time in solitary communion with the supreme god of his people. He appears to have succeeded in impressing on his countrymen a belief in his supernatural mission, for long after his death his statue enjoyed the supreme distinction of being preserved in the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, from which it was brought forth on high days and holidays to be carried through the streets in procession, while the statues of humbler mortals, who had deserved well of their country, fell into their place in the procession from the Forum below, where they ordinarily stood overlooking the bustle of business in the market and the law-courts.[1] Such a union of soldiership and statesmanship with religious exaltation is eminently fitted to attract the reverence of the multitude; it was one of the secrets of the Elder Scipio's power, and we can hardly doubt that it contributed largely to the belief of the Israelites in the divine legation of Moses.

Scipio's religious mysticism.

The Wafipas, an African tribe on the shores of Lake Tanganyika, relate a story of one of their kings which bears some resemblance to the story of the passage of Israel through the Red Sea. Being threatened with death by his enemies the Watwakis and by some of his own tribe, who were hostile to him, the king fled before them, but his flight was arrested by the waters of the great lake. Then he sacrificed a sheep, dipped his staff in the blood of the victim, and struck the surface of the water with the blood-stained staff. The lake immediately opened a passage for him, and through it he escaped from his pursuers.[2] The Bayas of the French Congo, on the borders of the Cameroons, have a similar tradition. They say that in the old days they were unacquainted with

African stories of miraculous passages through a lake or a river.

[1] Appian, *Hispan.* 23.

[2] Mgr. Lechaptois, *Aux rives du Tanganika* (Algiers, 1913), p. 54.

the art of working iron, and sent to another tribe at a distance to learn the secret. Their messengers had to cross the river Kadei, and attempted to do so in a bark canoe, but the frail vessel capsized. So they had recourse to magic; the river, mastered by their spells, divided in two, of which one part flowed back to its source, so that the messengers were able to traverse its bed without wetting their feet.[1]

[1] A. Poupon, "Étude ethnographique des Baya de la circonscription du M'bimoui," *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi. (1915) p. 122.

CHAPTER III

THE WATERS OF MERIBAH

How Moses produced water from a rock by smiting it with his staff.

AFTER their triumphant passage over the Red Sea, the children of Israel wandered in the desert, and finding no water to drink they murmured against Moses, saying, "Wherefore hast thou brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst?" And Moses cried to the Lord, saying, "What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me." And the Lord said unto Moses, "Pass on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel; and thy rod, wherewith thou smotest the river, take in thine hand, and go. Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink." And Moses did so. He lifted up his hand, and smote the rock with his rod twice; and water came forth abundantly, and the people drank, and their cattle also. And the springs which gushed from the rock at the stroke of Moses' rod were called the Waters of Meribah, that is, the Waters of Strife, because the people had striven with Moses.[1]

How an ancient hero in Celebes produced water from a rock by smiting it with his spear.

With this story of the magical production of water from the rock we may compare a legend told by the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes. They say that an ancient hero named Dori, the son of the first man Lasaeo, came on his travels with two slaves to a certain place, where he lodged for the night in a house. Now Dori was meanly clad, but his slaves wore fine clothes. So the people of the house took the slaves for noblemen, and their master they

[1] Exodus xvii. 1-7; Numbers xx. 1-13.

took for a slave. Therefore they gave Dori no water to wash his hands with, and no palm-wine to drink. Thereupon Dori went out and struck the rock with the butt end of his spear, making a hole in the rock, from which water gushed out. When Dori had washed his hands with the water, he struck another rock with his spear, and from the hole so made palm-wine flowed forth. Having drunk the wine, the hero closed up the hole; but the hole from which the water flowed may be seen to this day. After that the people perceived that Dori was a great man.[1]

[1] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 25.

CHAPTER IV

GIDEON'S MEN

LONG after the children of Israel had settled in Palestine, they continued to be little more than an aggregate of independent tribes, whose lack of cohesion and central government exposed them to the encroachments and invasions of their warlike neighbours. Among the nomads who harried them were the Midianites, a numerous tribe of robbers who, mounted on camels, emerged in swarms from the desert and scoured the country in all directions, sweeping it as bare of food for man and beast as if it had been traversed by an army of locusts. The miserable inhabitants fled before the raiders to the caves and dens of the mountains.[1] But when they prayed to the Lord, he sent his angel to Gideon, the son of Joash, who was threshing a little wheat with a stick in a winepress to hide it from any prowling Midianites, who might swoop down on him and rob him of his store. For the winepress, being a square or oblong vat excavated in the rock, afforded some concealment, whereas the high windy threshing-floor, where in ordinary times the wheat was trodden out by oxen, would have exposed him to the gaze of passers-by even at a considerable distance. Beside the winepress grew an oak, and under its shadow the angel sat down, glad perhaps to rest in the heat of the day and watch the thresher at his toil for a little time in silence. Then he called to Gideon and entered into conversation with him. And when Gideon complained to the courteous stranger, as he deemed him, of the evil plight to which the

The angel's charge to Gideon to deliver Israel from the Midianites.

[1] Judges vi. 1-6.

whole country was reduced by the ravages of the Midianites, the angel revealed himself in his true character and commanded Gideon to deliver his people Israel out of the hand of the oppressor.[1]

How Gideon mustered the tribes of Israel and chose three hundred men from the host to fight the Midianites, selecting them on the ground that they drank by scooping up water in their hands instead of, like the rest, by applying their mouths to the stream.

The hero obeyed the divine call, and having mustered the tribes of Israel he led them to the valley of Jezreel, where the host of the Midianites and their Bedouin allies was encamped. All along the valley their tents lay and their camels were tethered, as multitudinous as locusts or the sand on the sea-shore for number.[2] But the Lord feared that if the whole army of Israel attacked the whole army of Midian and won the victory, the people might be puffed up with carnal pride, and forgetting the Lord, to whom alone they could owe the success of their arms, might say, "Our own hand hath saved us." To prevent this deplorable illusion, the deity commanded Gideon to dismiss to their homes all the fearful and craven-hearted and to keep by him only the valiant and brave. Two-and-twenty thousand recreants gladly availed themselves of the leave of absence so unexpectedly granted them, and there remained facing the enemy just ten thousand stalwarts. Even that number, however, appeared too large to the Lord, as he foresaw that in case of a victory these gallant men would be apt to claim the credit of it for themselves instead of ascribing it to him. This was not to be thought of, and he therefore took steps to thin the ranks to such a point that nothing but a direct interposition of Providence could reasonably account for the triumph of battalions so depleted. The measure by which the reduction was effected was a singular one. The whole force was marched down to the river, and the word was given to drink water. Immediately a marked distinction was observed in the manner in which the command was executed. The great majority of the men; or to be exact, nine thousand and seven hundred of them, knelt down, and applying their mouths to the water drank it in by suction. The remainder, on the other hand, scooped the water up in their hands, and holding it to their mouths lapped it up with their tongues as dogs lap water. The three hundred were

[1] Judges vi. 11-24. [2] Judges vi. 33-vii. 1-12.

the men chosen to defeat the Midianites; the remaining nine thousand and seven hundred were sent back to their tents, there to witness from a distance the discomfiture of the enemy in which they were not to share.[1]

Similar distinction in the manner of drinking water recorded of some African tribes: custom of throwing water into the mouth with the hand.

We may conjecture that the test which Gideon thus employed to sift out his fighting men from the non-combatants was based on some well-known distinction in the manner of drinking adopted by different tribes or by the same people in different circumstances. It may therefore be helpful to note corresponding differences in the modes of drinking observed by savage tribes. Speaking of the Ogieg or Wandorobo, a tribe of British East Africa, Captain C. H. Stigand observes that they "drink from a stream on all fours, putting their mouths down to the water. Practically every other tribe drink, when no vessel is available, with the hand. They either take up water with one hand or both, or throw up water with the right hand and catch it in the mouth. The latter is the way most caravan porters drink."[2] Among the Bambalas of the Congo valley "water is the commonest drink, and in the village cups are used for drinking purposes; but on a march the water is thrown into the mouth with the hand; they lie down on their stomachs and, bending the fingers, scoop up the water without spilling a drop, though the hand never touches the mouth in the process."[3] When the Namaquas, a Hottentot tribe of South-West Africa, are out hunting, they always drink by throwing water into their mouths with their fingers, and they trace the custom to the Hottentot Adam or first man, who one day, hunting a lion, saw the animal lying in wait for him under a large mimosa tree beside a pool of water.

[1] Judges vii. 2-22. Commentators have been a good deal exercised by the attitudes respectively assumed in drinking by the chosen and the rejected champions of Israel. The interpretation given in the text is the only one consistent with the Hebrew and Greek text as it stands in the manuscripts, and as it is confirmed by Josephus (*Antiquit. Jud.* v. 6. 3), who clearly read it in the same way. Some critics (G. F. Moore in his commentary and R. Kittel in his edition of the Hebrew text) would remove the words "putting their hand to their mouth" (בְּיָדָם אֶל־פִּיהֶם) from the beginning to the end of verse 6, thus making it apply to the men who knelt down to drink. But the change is negatived by the text both of the Septuagint and of Josephus.

[2] Captain C. H. Stigand, *The Land of Zinj, being an Account of British East Africa* (London, 1913), pp. 274 *sq.*

[3] E. Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds* (London, 1913), p. 85.

The first man's dogs, on coming to the spot, lay down, lapped up the water, then shook themselves and frisked about. But the first man, more cautious, knelt down, holding his spear in his left hand, and drank the water by throwing it into his mouth with two fingers, while all the time he kept a sharp eye on the lion. When man and dogs had thus refreshed themselves, they attacked the lion and soon made an end of him. Since that time the Namaquas have always drunk water in the same way when they are out hunting.[1]

The custom of throwing water into the mouth with the hand observed in Cambodia, Samoa, and New Caledonia.

Again, a native of Cambodia, travelling through the forest, "ought not to drink by putting his mouth to the water, if he wishes not to be despised by tigers and other fierce animals. Let him drink by throwing water into his mouth with his hand, for then the denizens of the woods will respect him."[2] So, too, "a thirsty Samoan, in coming to a stream of water, stoops down, rests the palm of his left hand on his knee, and, with the right hand, throws the water up so quickly as to form a continued jet from the stream to his mouth, and there he laps until he is satisfied."[3] Similarly, the New Caledonians stoop till their head is a few inches above the water, and then throw the liquid into their mouth with one hand till their thirst is quenched.[4]

Custom of throwing water into the mouth with the hand in the New Hebrides.

Commenting on the story of Gideon's men, a missionary to Melanesia observes that "this lapping of the water like a dog by Gideon's army was unintelligible to me until I came to the New Hebrides. Standing one day by a stream I heard a noise behind me like a dog lapping water. I turned and saw a woman bowing down and throwing the water rapidly into her mouth with her hand. This satisfactorily explained the action of Gideon's men. It showed care and watchfulness; for they could walk along the stream lapping the water as they went; and an enemy was

[1] Theophilus Hahn, "Die Nama-Hottentoten," *Globus*, xii. No. 9, p. 277; *id.*, *Tsuni-||Goam, the Supreme Being of the Khoi-Khoi* (London, 1881), p. 71.

[2] E. Aymonier, "Notes sur les Coutumes et Croyances superstitieuses des Cambodgiens," *Cochinchine Française, Excursions et Reconnaissances*, No. 16 (Saigon, 1883), p. 165.

[3] George Turner, *Nineteen Years in Polynesia* (London, 1861), p. 332.

[4] Labillardière, *Relation du Voyage à la Recherche de la Pérouse* (Paris, 1800), ii. 196.

less likely to take them unawares than if they bent on their knees to drink. Most of the natives, however, bend down and touch the water with their lips as the rejected men of Gideon's army did." [1]

The custom of throwing water into the mouth instead of lying down to drink suitable to men who must be on the alert.

These examples suggest that the custom of drinking water by throwing it into the mouth with the hand, instead of kneeling or lying down to drink with the lips placed close to the stream, has been adopted by certain classes of men, such as hunters or porters, whose occupation renders it either unsafe or difficult to adopt the other posture in quenching their thirst. It seems, therefore, not impossible that Gideon's men were selected on the same principle, because by standing instead of lying down to drink they showed themselves more watchful and ready to meet any sudden emergency.

Gideon's reduction of his fighting force compared with an incident in the wars of Massachusetts with the Indians.

With the manner in which the God-fearing Gideon strengthened his army by reducing its numbers to a mere skeleton, we may compare an incident in a war which the God-fearing colonists of Massachusetts waged with their deadly and still dangerous enemies the Indians. "The different colonies had agreed to unite against the common enemy, each furnishing a quota of men in proportion to its numbers. The troops of Connecticut, which lay most exposed to danger, were soon assembled. The march of those from Massachusetts, which formed the most considerable body, was retarded by the most singular cause that ever influenced the operations of a military force. When they were mustered previous to their departure, it was found that some of the officers, as well as of the private soldiers, were still under a covenant of works; and that the blessing of God could not be implored or expected to crown the arms of such unhallowed men with success. The alarm was general, and many arrangements necessary in order to cast out the unclean, and to render this little band sufficiently pure to fight the battles of a people who entertained high ideas of their own sanctity." [2]

Not the least remarkable feature in this curious narrative

[1] William Gunn, *The Gospel in Futuna* (London, 1914), p. 276.

[2] William Robertson, D.D., *The History of America*, Eleventh Edition (London, 1806–1808), iv. 308 *sq.*

is the inability of the reverend narrator, in whom the learning of an historian would seem to have outweighed the piety of a divine, to conceive why any force of armed men should delay their march against the enemy for a reason so manifestly absurd as a scruple of religion.

CHAPTER V

JOTHAM'S FABLE

How Abimelech murdered all his brothers save Jotham and made himself king of Shechem.

WHEN Gideon had delivered Israel out of the hand of the Midianites, the grateful people asked him to be their king, and to bequeath the kingdom after him to his son and his son's son. But the magnanimous hero, content with the deliverance he had wrought, and unmoved by the promptings of vulgar ambition, declined the offer of a crown, and, retiring to his own house at Ophrah, lived there to a good old age. At his death he left behind him seventy sons, whom he had by his many wives, as well as a son named Abimelech, whom he had by a concubine in Shechem.[1] When he came to man's estate, Abimelech gave proof of exorbitant ambition and the most ruthless temper. With the help of his mother's family at Shechem he intrigued with the men of that city to elect him their king, and having received a loan of money from them he hired a band of ruffians, with whom he hastened to his father's house at Ophrah and there murdered all his brothers but one on the same stone; only Jotham, the youngest son of Gideon, escaped the massacre by hiding himself. Having thus removed his possible rivals, Abimelech returned to Shechem and was there crowned king beside a sacred oak.[2]

How Jotham came and spoke to the men of Shechem from the top of Mount Gerizim.

When Jotham, the youngest son, heard in his place of concealment that the men of Shechem had made Abimelech their king, he went and stood on Mount Gerizim, which rises on the south side of the city, and there he lifted up his voice and addressed the people in a parable. For Shechem, the modern Nablus, lies in a deep valley hemmed

[1] Judges viii. 22-32.

[2] Judges ix. 1-6.

in by Mount Gerizim on the south and by Mount Ebal on the north, which rise so steeply and are so near each other, that standing on the top of Gerizim it is possible to hear distinctly every word a man speaks on the opposite mountain.[1] Indeed people in these mountainous districts, it is said, are able, from long practice, so to pitch their voices as to be clearly audible at almost incredible distances. They will converse with each other across enormous gullies, giving the most minute directions, which are perfectly understood, and in doing so they seem hardly to raise their voices above their usual tone. There is, therefore, no difficulty in supposing that, speaking from one of the overhanging crags of Gerizim, as from a natural pulpit, Jotham might easily be heard by the greater part of the inhabitants of Shechem.[2] The parable which he addressed to them ran as follows:—

Jotham's fable of the trees which asked the bramble to reign over them.

"The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive-tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honour God and man, and go to wave to and fro over the trees? And the trees said to the fig-tree, Come thou, and reign over us. But the fig-tree said unto them, Should I leave my sweetness and my good fruit, and go to wave to and fro over the trees? And the trees said unto the vine, Come thou, and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, Should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to wave to and fro over the trees? Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow: and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon."[3]

The application of the fable to Abimelech and the men of Shechem.

This fable of the trees Jotham then proceeded to apply to the base-born and villainous Abimelech, who had clutched the crown which his noble father Gideon had refused. Having fitted the cap to the crowned head of his half-brother, and hinted darkly at the righteous doom which would yet overtake both the wicked king and his subjects,

[1] H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*[4] (London, 1882), p. 149.

[2] W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (London, 1859), pp. 473 *sq.*

[3] Judges ix. 7-15.

Jotham turned on his heel and fled, before the men of Shechem could climb up the steep mountain and lay hands on him.[1]

The fable a political satire.

In the mouth of Jotham the fable of the trees would seem to be a democratic or perhaps rather theocratic satire on kingship, for according to him all the noble and useful trees declined the office, so that in despair the trees were driven to offer the crown to the meanest and most useless of their number, who only accepted it on a condition which practically involved the destruction of the aristocracy of the woods, the cedars of Lebanon. The distrust of monarchy which the parable implies was natural enough in the honest son of an honest patriot, who had refused to rule over his people, and had declared that the rule of God was better than the rule of man;[2] and the same distrust of kings and the same preference for a theocracy are expressed still more plainly by the Hebrew historian who records, with evident reluctance and regret, the institution of the monarchy under Saul.[3] But apart from any political application the story of the rivalry between the trees for the primacy would seem to have been popular in antiquity. It occurs more than once in the fables of Aesop. Thus the fir-tree, we read, one day said boastfully to the bramble, "You are good for nothing, but I am useful in roofs and houses." To which the bramble replied, "O wretched creature, if you only remembered the axes and the saws that will chop and cut you, glad enough would you be to be a bramble instead of a fir."[4] Again, a pomegranate and an apple-tree disputed with each other as to which was the more fruitful, and when the dispute was at its height, a bramble called out from a neighbouring hedge, "O my friends, do let us stop fighting."[5] In both these fables, as in the fable of Jotham, the bramble intervenes in the discussion between the trees of higher social pretensions.

Rivalry between trees in Aesop's fables.

Poem of Callimachus on the rivalry of the laurel and the olive.

The same theme was treated much more elaborately by the Alexandrian poet Callimachus in a poem, of which a

[1] Judges ix. 16-21.

[2] Judges viii. 23.

[3] 1 Samuel viii. 4-22.

[4] *Fabulae Aesopicae*, ed. C. Halm (Leipsic, 1881), p. 63, No. 125. The fable was versified by Babrius (*Fab.* 64, pp. 63 *sq.*, ed. W. G. Rutherford, London, 1883).

[5] *Fabulae Aesopicae*, ed. C. Halm, p. 187, No. 385.

copy, written on papyrus, was discovered in Egypt during the winter of 1905–1906. The verses unfortunately are mutilated and incomplete, but so far as they go they describe a contest for supremacy between a laurel and an olive-tree, in which, up to the point where the manuscript breaks off, the olive-tree appears to get much the better of the argument. So far as the lines can be read or probably restored, the fable runs as follows:[1]—

The laurel's speech.

"Hear, then, the fable. The ancient Lydians say that once on a time the laurel contended with the olive on Mount Tmolus. For the laurel was a tall tree and fair, and fluttering her branches thus she spoke: 'What house is there at whose doorposts I am not set up? What soothsayer or what sacrificer bears me not? The Pythian prophetess, too, she sits on laurel, eats of laurel,[2] lies on laurel. O foolish olive, did not Branchus heal Ionia's sons with but a stroke of laurel and a few muttered words, what time Phoebus was wroth with them? I go to feasts and to the Pythian choral dance, I am given as a prize in games, and the Dorians cut me at Tempe on the mountain tops and bear me thence to Delphi, whene'er Apollo's rites are solemnized. O foolish olive, no sorrow do I know, nor mine the path that the corpse-bearer treads. For I am pure, and men tread me not under foot, for I am holy. But with thee they crown themselves whene'er they are about to burn a corpse or lay it out for burial, and thee they duly spread under the dead man's ribs.'

The olive's reply.

"So spake she boasting; but the mother of the oil answered her calmly: 'O laurel, barren of all the things I bear, thou hast sung like a swan at the end. . . . I attend to the grave the men whom Ares slays, and (under the

[1] *The Oxyrrhynchus Papyri*, Part vii., edited with translations and notes by Arthur S. Hunt (London, 1910), pp. 39 *sqq*. The poem has been translated into German and accompanied with instructive parallels and notes by my learned friend Professor Hermann Diels, who has kindly given me a copy of his paper ("Orientalische Fabeln in griechischem Gewande," *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft Kunst und Technik*, 6th August 1910, coll. 1-10). In his translation Professor Diels to some extent tacitly supplements and corrects the Greek text, and in my version I have availed myself of some of his suggestions.

[2] The Greek is δάφνην δ' ἀείδει, "sings of laurel." But this should probably be corrected with Professor H. Diels. The prophetess chewed laurel as a mode of inspiration. See Lucian, *Bis Accusatus*, 1; J. Tzetzes, *Scholia on Lycophron*, 6.

heads am spread) of heroes who (died gloriously). And when children bear to the tomb their white-haired grandam or Tithonus old, I go with them and on the path am laid, (helping them) more than thou (doest help) the men who bring thee from Tempe's dale. But as for that thou spakest of, am not I a better prize than thou? for are not the games at Olympia greater than the games at Delphi?[1] But silence is best. Not a word more concerning thee shall I so much as mutter, neither good nor bad. Yet lo! the birds that perch among my leaves are twittering thus: "Who found the laurel? It was the earth who brought it forth as she brings forth the ilex, the oak, the galingale, or other woodland things. But who found the olive? Pallas it was, when she contended for the shore with him who dwells amid the sea-weed, and the ancient one gave judgment, he the man with snaky limbs below.[2] That is one fall for the laurel! But of the immortals, who honours the olive, and who the laurel? Apollo honours the laurel, and Pallas honours the olive, which she found. In that they are alike, for I distinguish not between the gods. But what is the laurel's fruit? How shall I use it? It is good neither to eat nor to drink nor to anoint one's self with. But pleasing is the olive's fruit in many ways, both as a food and as an unguent. . . . That is, I think, the laurel's second fall. And then what is the tree whose leaves the suppliants hold out? The olive's leaves. That is the laurel's third fall." But plague on these birds, will they never stop? They must still be chattering! Impudent crow, is thy beak not sore with croaking? "Whose trunk is it that the Delians preserve? It is the olive's, which gave a seat to Leto."' . . . So spake the olive. But the laurel's rage swelled at the words, and the smart struck deeper than before. (And now an ancient spreading thorn-bush[3]) spoke

[1] An olive-wreath was the prize at Olympia, a laurel-wreath at Delphi.

[2] An allusion to the contest of Athena and Poseidon for possession of Attica; according to the version of the legend followed by the poet it seems that Erichthonius, half-man, half-serpent, acted as arbiter and gave judgment in the dispute. But this was not the usual version of the story, as to which I may refer to my note on Pausanias i. 24. 3.

[3] So Professor H. Diels restores the meaning ("*Da sprach ein altes, weitverranktes Dornsträuchlein*"). But the corresponding line in the Greek text is very fragmentary, and any emendation must be more or less uncertain.

up, for she was not far from the trees. 'O my poor friends,' quoth she, 'do let us cease, lest we carry the quarrel too far. Come, let's give over bickering.' But the laurel glared daggers at the thorn, and thus she spake: 'O cursed wretch, don't preach patience to me, as if thou wert one of us. Thy very neighbourhood chokes me. By Phoebus, by Persephone, talk not of reconciliation! Slay me rather!'"

The poem incomplete: probable triumph of the olive.

At this point the poem breaks off in the manuscript, and we cannot say how the quarrel between the trees ended, but from the poet's evident partiality for the olive, we may conjecture that the subsequent verses described the triumph of that pacific, fruitful, and useful tree over the bellicose, barren, and boastful laurel. What tree or shrub it was that attempted to intervene as peacemaker in the strife, and got small thanks for its pains from one at least of the disputants, we cannot say for certain, since the Greek text at this point is mutilated; but the analogy of one of Aesop's fables, in which a bramble attempts to end a dispute between a pomegranate and an apple-tree,[1] suggests that the humble bush may have played the same benevolent but thankless part in the poem of Callimachus, and the suggestion is borne out by the sharp way in which the proud laurel turns on the would-be mediator, whose claim to meddle in a quarrel between trees she contemptuously rejects ("as if thou wert one of us").

Rivalry between the trees in an Armenian fable.

The rivalry between the trees appears to be a favourite theme of Armenian fables. For example, in one of them it is said that the plants held a council to decide which of them deserved to reign over the rest. Some proposed the date-palm, because he is tall and his fruits are sweet. But the vine resisted the proposal, saying, "It is I who diffuse joy; it is I who deserve to reign." The fig-tree said, "It is I, for I am sweet to the taste." The thorn said, "The honour should be mine, because I prick." Each of them thought himself better than the rest, and imagined that he could dispense with them. As for the date-palm, on reflection he perceived that the trees would not let him reign, because they were loth to share their honours with others. He said, "It belongs to me rather than to anybody else to be king." The other trees admitted his claim to a certain

[1] Above, p. 473.

extent. They said, "Thou art tall and thy fruits are sweet, but thou lackest two things. Thou dost not bear fruit at the same time that we do, and thou art not suitable for building. Besides, thou art so tall that it is impossible for many people to enjoy thy fruit." He answered, "I shall become king and make you princes, and after accomplishing my time I shall still reign over your sons." He set the kingdom in order, naming the rest to various offices. The vine he made chief cupbearer, the fig-tree consul, the thorn head executioner, the pomegranate head physician; other plants were to serve for medicines, the cedars for building, the forests for fuel, the bushes for prison; each was assigned its special task.[1]

Malay story of a dispute between plants on the question of precedence between them.

A Malay story tells of a dispute between the plants as to their respective claims to precedence. Once upon a time, we are informed, the maize-plant boasted, saying, "If rice should cease to exist, I alone should suffice to sustain mankind." But the liane and the jungle yam each made a like boast, and as the parties could not agree, the case was brought before King Solomon. Said Solomon, "All three of you are perfectly right, albeit it were perhaps better that the maize-plant should sustain mankind because of his comradeship with the bean." Thereat the wrath of the liane and the yam waxed hot against the maize-plant, and they went off together to hunt for a fruit-spike of the jungle fig-tree whereon to impale him, but found none. And meanwhile the maize-plant, hearing news of their quest, set to work to find arrow-poison. And when he found it he poisoned the jungle yam therewith, wherefore to this day the jungle yam has narcotic properties. Then the jungle yam, being wroth thereat, speared the maize-plant in his turn, wherefore to this day the cobs of the maize are perforated. And the maize-plant, reaching out in turn, seized the pointed shoot of a *wilang* (?) stem and wounded the liane therewith. At this juncture the parties to the quarrel went before the

[1] F. Macler, "Choix de fables Arméniennes attribuées à Mkhithar Goch," *Journal Asiatique*, Neuvième Série, xix. (Paris, 1902) pp. 467 *sq.* This fable has already been cited by Professor H. Diels, *op. cit.* col. 10. In the same collection of Armenian fables there are stories of disputes between a thorn and a vine, between an apple and a pear, between a fig and a pomegranate, between a mulberry and an olive, etc.

prophet Elias, who said, "This matter is too great for me, take ye it before Solomon." And Solomon said, "Let them fight it out between them, that the rage of their hearts may be appeased." Wherefore there was battle between them for twice seven days. And when the twice seven days were ended, the battle being still undecided, the combatants were parted, and a space was set between them by Solomon. And the jungle yam he made to sit down, and the liane to lie down. But the maize-plant and the bean he made to stand together.[1]

Jotham's fable inserted in mediaeval collections of fables.

During the Middle Ages the fable of the trees, which the Book of Judges puts in the mouth of Jotham, appears to have been popular, for we find it detached from its Biblical setting and inserted in miscellaneous collections of fables which were derived, directly or indirectly, from Phaedrus. In some of these collections the story is taken with but slight verbal changes from the Vulgate,[2] but in a Latin version of the fables which pass under the name of the mediaeval French poetess Marie de France, the writer has handled the theme more freely. The trees, so runs the fable, once assembled and consulted about choosing a king. A tall and spreading tree proposed the vine for the kingly office, but the vine refused on the ground that he was weak and could do nothing without a support. So the trees offered to choose the whitethorn, saying that he deserved to reign because he was strong and handsome. But the whitethorn declined the offer, declaring that he was not worthy to reign because he bore no fruit. Several other trees were proposed, but they all excused themselves for various reasons. At last, when no tree could be found that would consent to be king, the broom got up and said, "The sceptre is mine by rights, because I desire to reign and I ought to be king, for my family is most opulent and noble." But the other trees answered the broom, "In the whole family of trees we know none meaner or poorer than thee." The broom replied, "If I am not made king, never will I honour him whom ye shall elect, neither will I love those who appoint another than me." The trees

[1] Walter Skeat, *Fables and Folk-Tales from an Eastern Forest* (Cambridge, 1901), pp. 13-15. I have slightly abridged the story.

[2] L. Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes Latins, Phèdre et ses Anciens Imitateurs*, (Paris, 1884), ii. 589 *sq.*, 761.

said to him, "What, then, will you be able to do to us if you do not love our king or us?" The broom answered, "Though I seem to you mean and needy, yet could I do that which I had thought to do if I were king." And they all asked him what that was. He said to them, "I had thought to prevent any tree from growing that stands under me or over me." "It is likely enough," replied the others, "that thou couldst do that to us if thou wert king and powerful; but what thinkest thou canst thou do when we are stronger than thou?" But the broom did not answer the question, he only said, "I cannot harm you without injuring myself. Yet I will carry out my intention. I can cause," said he, "that any herb or tree that is under me shall cease to grow, and that any that is above me shall wither. But to do that it is necessary that I myself should burn. Therefore I wish to be consumed with fire, with all my kindred that are about me, in order that those trees which deem themselves great and noble may perish with me in the flames."[1]

This fable is plainly nothing but a feeble expansion of the fable of Jotham.

[1] L. Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes Latins, Phèdre et ses Anciens Imitateurs*, ii. 581 *sq.*

CHAPTER VI

SAMSON AND DELILAH

Incongruity of the filibuster Samson among the judges of Israel.

AMONG the grave judges of Israel the burly hero Samson cuts a strange figure. That he judged Israel for twenty years we are indeed informed by the sacred writer,[1] but of the judgments which he delivered in his judicial character not one has been recorded, and if the tenor of his pronouncements can be inferred from the nature of his acts, we may be allowed to doubt whether he particularly adorned the bench of justice. His talent would seem to have lain rather in the direction of brawling and fighting, burning down people's corn-ricks, and beating up the quarters of loose women; in short, he appears to have shone in the character of a libertine and a rakehell rather than in a strictly judicial capacity. Instead of a dull list of his legal decisions we are treated to an amusing, if not very edifying, narrative of his adventures in love and in war, or rather in filibustering; for if we accept, as we are bound to do, the scriptural account of this roystering swashbuckler, he never levied a regular war or headed a national insurrection against the Philistines, the oppressors of his people; he merely sallied forth from time to time as a solitary paladin or knight-errant, and mowed them down with the jawbone of an ass or any other equally serviceable weapon that came to his hand. And even on these predatory expeditions (for he had no scruple about relieving his victims of their clothes and probably of their purses) the idea of delivering his nation from servitude was to all appearance the last thing that would have occurred to him. If he massacred the Philistines, as he certainly did in great profusion and with

[1] Judges xv. 20, xvi. 31.

hearty good will, it was from no high motive of patriotism or policy, but purely from a personal grudge which he bore them for the wrongs which they had done to himself, to his wife, and to his father-in-law. From first to last his story is that of an utterly selfish and unscrupulous adventurer, swayed by gusts of fitful passion and indifferent to everything but the gratification of his momentary whims. It is only redeemed from the staleness and vulgarity of commonplace rascality by the elements of supernatural strength, headlong valour, and a certain grim humour which together elevate it into a sort of burlesque epic after the manner of Ariosto. But these features, while they lend piquancy to the tale of his exploits, hardly lessen the sense of incongruity which we experience on coming across the grotesque figure of this swaggering, hectoring bully side by side with the solemn effigies of saints and heroes in the Pantheon of Israel's history. The truth seems to be that in the extravagance of its colouring the picture of Samson owes more to the brush of the story-teller than to the pen of the historian. The marvellous and diverting incidents of his disreputable career probably floated about loosely as popular tales on the current of oral tradition long before they crystallized around the memory of a real man, a doughty highlander and borderer, a sort of Hebrew Rob Roy, whose choleric temper, dauntless courage, and prodigious bodily strength marked him out as the champion of Israel in many a wild foray across the border into the rich lowlands of Philistia. For there is no sufficient reason to doubt that a firm basis of fact underlies the flimsy and transparent superstructure of fancy in the Samson saga. The particularity with which the scenes of his life, from birth to death, are laid in definite towns and places, speaks strongly in favour of a genuine local tradition, and as strongly against the theory of a solar myth, into which some writers would dissolve the story of the brawny hero.[1]

His burlesque epic.

A Hebrew Rob Roy.

The home country of Samson, about Zorah, on the Philistine border, has been described by Sir George Adam

The home country of Samson.

[1] H. Steinthal, "The Legend of Samson," in Ignaz Goldziher's *Mythology among the Hebrews* (London, 1877), pp. 392-446; A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*[2] (Leipsic, 1906), pp. 478-482; Paul Carus, *The Story of Samson* (Chicago, 1907); A. Smythe Palmer, D.D., *The Samson-Saga* (London, 1913).

Smith with characteristic sympathy and grace. "It is as fair a nursery for boyhood as you will find in all the land—a hillside facing south against the sunshine, with corn, grass, and olives, scattered boulders and winter brooks, the broad valley below with the pebbly stream and screens of oleanders, the south-west wind from the sea blowing over all. There *the child Samson grew up; and the Lord blessed him, and the Spirit of the Lord began to move him in the camp of Dan between Zorah and Eshtaol.* Across the valley of Sorek, in full view is Beth-Shemesh, now 'Ain Shems, House and Well of the Sun, with which name it is so natural to connect his own—Shimshon, 'Sun-like.' Over the low hills beyond is Timnah, where he found his first love and killed the young lion. Beyond is the Philistine plain, with its miles upon miles of corn, which, if as closely sown then as now, would require scarce three, let alone three hundred foxes, with torches on their tails, to set it all afire. The Philistine cities are but a day's march away, by easy roads. And so from these country braes to yonder plains and the highway of the great world—from the pure home and the mother who talked with angels, to the heathen cities, their harlots and their prisons—we see at one sweep of the eye all the course in which this uncurbed strength, at first tumbling and sporting with laughter like one of its native brooks, like them also ran to the flats and the mud, and, being darkened and befouled, was used by men to turn their mills."[1]

The hand of the storyteller reveals itself most clearly in the account of the catastrophe which befel his hero through the wiles of a false woman, who wormed from him the secret of his great strength and then betrayed him to his enemies. The account runs as follows:—

How Samson's great strength

"And it came to pass afterward, that he loved a woman in the valley of Sorek, whose name was Delilah. And the lords of the Philistines came up unto her, and said unto her,

[1] (Sir) George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London, 1894), pp. 221 *sq.* While he mentions the possible connexion of Samson's name with the Hebrew word for sun, Sir George Adam Smith rightly rejects the solar theory of his adventures. "The attempts," he says, "to interpret them as phases or influences of the sun, or to force them into a cycle like the labours of Hercules, have broken down." Nevertheless the breakdown has not deterred subsequent writers from attempting to set the mythical Humpty-Dumpty up again.

'Entice him, and see wherein his great strength lieth, and by what means we may prevail against him, that we may bind him to afflict him: and we will give thee every one of us eleven hundred pieces of silver.' And Delilah said to Samson, 'Tell me, I pray thee, wherein thy great strength lieth, and wherewith thou mightest be bound to afflict thee.' And Samson said unto her, 'If they bind me with seven green withes that were never dried, then shall I become weak, and be as another man.' Then the lords of the Philistines brought up to her seven green withes which had not been dried, and she bound him with them. Now she had liers in wait abiding in the inner chamber. And she said unto him, 'The Philistines be upon thee, Samson.' And he brake the withes, as a string of tow is broken when it toucheth the fire. So his strength was not known. And Delilah said unto Samson, 'Behold, thou hast mocked me, and told me lies: now tell me, I pray thee, wherewith thou mightest be bound.' And he said unto her, 'If they only bind me with new ropes wherewith no work hath been done, then shall I become weak, and be as another man.' So Delilah took new ropes, and bound him therewith, and said unto him, 'The Philistines be upon thee, Samson.' And the liers in wait were abiding in the inner chamber. And he brake them from off his arms like a thread. And Delilah said unto Samson, 'Hitherto thou hast mocked me, and told me lies: tell me wherewith thou mightest be bound. And he said unto her, 'If thou weavest the seven locks of my head with the web, *and makest (the whole) fast with the pin, then shall I become weak and like any other man.' And Delilah made him sleep, and wove the seven locks of his head with the web*,[1] and she fastened

was in his hair; how the false Delilah wormed the secret from him, and, having shaved off his hair, betrayed him to his enemies the Philistines.

[1] The words printed in italics have been accidentally omitted from the Hebrew text, but they can be restored from the Greek versions. See the commentaries of G. F. Moore (*The International Critical Commentary*) and G. W. Thatcher (*The Century Bible*), and R. Kittel's critical edition of the Hebrew text (Leipsic, 1905–1906). The Greek translator seems to have thought that Delilah pegged Samson's locks into the wall (ἔπηξε τῷ πασσάλῳ εἰς τὸν τοῖχον), and Jerome that she pegged them into the earth ("*Si septem crines capitis mei cum licio plexueris, et clavum his circumligatum terrae fixeris*"). But what she really did was to weave his hair, like threads, into the web on the loom, so that every single hair was fastened separately. This gave a far stronger hold on Samson than if his hair had been pegged in a bunch into the wall or the earth; and in wrenching it away he wrenched with it the web and the loom, or part of it ("the beam").

it with the pin, and said unto him, 'The Philistines be upon thee, Samson.' And he awaked out of his sleep, and plucked away the pin of the beam, and the web. And she said unto him, 'How canst thou say, I love thee, when thine heart is not with me? thou hast mocked me these three times, and hast not told me wherein thy great strength lieth.' And it came to pass, when she pressed him daily with her words, and urged him, that his soul was vexed unto death. And he told her all his heart, and said unto her, 'There hath not come a razor upon mine head; for I have been a Nazirite unto God from my mother's womb: if I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak, and be like any other man.' And when Delilah saw that he had told her all his heart, she sent and called for the lords of the Philistines, saying, 'Come up this once, for he hath told me all his heart.' Then the lords of the Philistines came up unto her, and brought the money in their hand. And she made him sleep upon her knees; and she called for a man, and shaved off the seven locks of his head; and she began to afflict him, and his strength went from him. And she said, 'The Philistines be upon thee, Samson.' And he awoke out of his sleep, and said, 'I will go out as at other times, and shake myself.' But he wist not that the Lord was departed from him. And the Philistines laid hold on him, and put out his eyes; and they brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison house."[1]

Belief in the East Indies that a person's strength is in his or her hair.

Thus it was supposed that Samson's great strength resided in his hair, and that to shave the long shaggy locks, which flowed down on his shoulders and had remained unshorn from infancy, would suffice to rob him of his superhuman vigour and reduce him to impotence. In various parts of the world a similar belief has prevailed as to living men and women, especially such as lay claim, like Samson, to powers above the reach of common mortals. Thus the natives of Amboyna, an island in the East Indies, used to think that their strength was in their hair and would desert them if their locks were shorn. A criminal under torture in a Dutch court of that island persisted in denying his guilt

[1] Judges xvi. 4-22.

till his hair was cut off, when he immediately confessed. One man, who was tried for murder, endured without flinching the utmost ingenuity of his torturers till he saw the surgeon standing by with a pair of shears. On asking what they were for, and being told that it was to shave his hair, he begged that they would not do it, and made a clean breast. In subsequent cases, when torture failed to wring a confession from a prisoner, the Dutch authorities made a practice of cutting off his hair.[1] The natives of Ceram, another East Indian Island, still believe that if young people have their hair cut they will be weakened and enervated thereby.[2]

Belief in Europe that the maleficent power of witches and wizards resides in their hair.

Here in Europe it used to be thought that the maleficent powers of witches and wizards resided in their hair, and that nothing could make any impression on these miscreants so long as they kept their hair on. Hence in France it was customary to shave the whole bodies of persons charged with sorcery before handing them over to the tormentor. Millaeus witnessed the torture of some persons at Toulouse, from whom no confession could be wrung until they were stripped and completely shaven, when they readily acknowledged the truth of the charge. A woman also, who apparently led a pious life, was put to the torture on suspicion of witchcraft, and bore her agonies with incredible constancy, until complete depilation drove her to admit her guilt. The noted inquisitor Sprenger contented himself with shaving the head of the suspected witch or warlock; but his more thoroughgoing colleague Cumanus shaved the whole bodies of forty-one women before committing them all to the flames. He had high authority for this rigorous scrutiny, since Satan himself, in a sermon preached from the pulpit of North Berwick church, comforted his many servants by assuring them that no harm could befall them "sa lang as their hair wes on, and

[1] François Valentyn, *Oud en Nieuw Oost-Indiën* (Dordrecht and Amsterdam, 1724-1726), ii. 143 *sq.* These facts and other of the folk-lore parallels cited below were first adduced in illustration of the Samson story by the late Dutch scholar, G. A. Wilken. See his instructive essay "De Simsonsage," *De Gids*, No. 5, reprinted in his collected writings, *De verspreide Geschriften* (The Hague, 1912), iii. 551-579. Most of the following parallels have already been cited by me elsewhere (*Balder the Beautiful*, ii. 103 *sq.*, 108 *sq.*–113, 126-129, 148, 158 *sq.*; *Passages of the Bible chosen for their literary beauty and interest*, Second Edition, London, 1909, pp. 471 *sq.*).

[2] J. G. F. Riedel, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua* (The Hague, 1886), p. 137.

Similar belief as to witches and wizards in India and Mexico.

sould newir latt ane teir fall fra thair ene."[1] Similarly in Bastar, a province of India, "if a man is adjudged guilty of witchcraft, he is beaten by the crowd, his hair is shaved, the hair being supposed to constitute his power of mischief, his front teeth are knocked out, in order, it is said, to prevent him from muttering incantations. . . . Women suspected of sorcery have to undergo the same ordeal; if found guilty, the same punishment is awarded, and after being shaved, their hair is attached to a tree in some public place."[2] So among the Bhils, a rude race of Central India, when a woman was convicted of witchcraft and had been subjected to various forms of persuasion, such as hanging head downwards from a tree and having pepper rubbed into her eyes, a lock of hair was cut from her head and buried in the ground, "that the last link between her and her former powers of mischief might be broken."[3] In like manner among the Aztecs of Mexico, when wizards and witches "had done their evil deeds, and the time came to put an end to their detestable life, some one laid hold of them and cropped the hair on the crown of their heads, which took from them all their power of sorcery and enchantment, and then it was that by death they put an end to their odious existence."[4]

Story told in the island of Nias about a king whose life was in his hair, and whose fatal secret was betrayed by his treacherous daughter to his enemies.

It is no wonder that a belief so widespread should find its way into fairy tales which, for all the seeming licence of fancy, reflect as in a mirror the real faith once held by the people among whom the stories circulated. The natives of Nias, an island off the west coast of Sumatra, relate that once upon a time a certain chief named Laubo Maros was driven by an earthquake from Macassar, in Celebes, and migrated with his followers to Nias. Among those who followed his fortunes to the new land were his uncle and his uncle's wife. But the rascally nephew fell in love with his uncle's wife and contrived by a stratagem to get possession of the lady. The injured husband fled to Malacca and besought the Sultan of Johore to assist him in avenging his

[1] J. G. Dalyell, *The Darker Superstitions of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1834), pp. 637-639; C. de Mensignac, *Recherches ethnographiques sur la Salive et le Crachat* (Bordeaux, 1892), p. 49 note.

[2] W. Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folk-lore of Northern India* (Westminster, 1896), ii. 281.

[3] W. Crooke, *op. cit.* ii. 281 *sq.*

[4] B. de Sahagun, *Histoire des choses de la Nouvelle Espagne*, traduite par D. Jourdanet et R. Simeon (Paris, 1880), p. 274.

wrongs. The Sultan consented and declared war on Laubo Maros. Meanwhile, however, that unscrupulous chief had fortified his settlement with an impenetrable hedge of prickly bamboo, which defied all the attempts of the Sultan and his troops to take it by storm. Defeated in open battle, the wily Sultan now had recourse to stratagem. He returned to Johore and there laded a ship with Spanish mats. Then he sailed back to Nias, and anchoring off his enemy's fort he loaded his guns with the Spanish mats instead of with shot and shell, and so opened fire on the place. The mats flew like hail through the air and soon were lying thick on the prickly hedge of the fort and on the shore in its neighbourhood. The trap was now set and the Sultan waited to see what would follow. He had not long to wait. An old woman, prowling along the beach, picked up one of the mats and saw the rest spread out temptingly around her. Overjoyed at the discovery she passed the good news among her neighbours, who hastened to the spot, and in a trice the prickly hedge was not only stripped bare of the mats but torn down and levelled with the ground. So the Sultan of Johore and his men had only to march into the fort and take possession. The defenders fled, but the wicked chief himself fell into the hands of the victors. He was condemned to death, but great difficulty was experienced in executing the sentence. They threw him into the sea, but the water would not drown him; they laid him on a blazing pyre, but the fire would not burn him; they hacked at every part of his body with swords, but steel would not pierce him. Then they perceived that he was an enchanter, and they consulted his wife to learn how they might kill him. Like Delilah, she revealed the fatal secret. On the chief's head grew a hair as hard as a copper wire, and with this wire his life was bound up. So the hair was plucked out, and with it his spirit fled.[1] In this and some of the following tales it is not merely the strength but the life of the hero which is supposed to have its seat in his hair, so that the loss of the hair involves his death.

[1] J. T. Nieuwenhuisen en H. C. B. von Rosenberg, "Verslag omtrent het eiland Nias," *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, xxx. (Batavia, 1863) pp. 110 *sq.* Compare H. Sundermann, *Die Insel Nias* (Barmen, 1905), p. 71.

Scottish tradition about the wizard Lord Soulis and his charmed life.

With the vain attempts to kill the wizard and the fruitless efforts to bind Samson, so long as the fateful hair was unshorn, we may compare the Scottish tradition as to the death of the wicked Lord Soulis, a wizard who bore a charmed life and had in his service a familiar spirit called Redcap. The story is told in a ballad by John Leyden, from which the following verses are extracted :—

" Lord Soulis he sat in Hermitage Castle,
And beside him Old Redcap sly;
' Now tell me, thou sprite, who art meikle of might,
The death that I must die?' —

' While thou shalt bear a charmed life,
And hold that life of me,
'Gainst lance and arrow, sword and knife,
I shall thy warrant be.

' Nor forged steel, nor hempen band,
Shall e'er thy limbs confine,
Till threefold ropes of sifted sand
Around thy body twine.'

. . . . .

' Ay, many may come, but few return,'
Quo' Soulis, the lord of gramarye;
' No warrior's hand in fair Scotland
Shall ever dint a wound on me!'—

' Now by my sooth,' quo' bold Walter,
' If that be true we soon shall see.'—
His bent bow he drew, and his arrow was true,
But never a wound or scar had he.

Then up bespake him true Thomas,
He was the lord of Ersyltoun;
' The wizard's spell no steel can quell,
Till once your lances bear him down.'—

They bore him down with lances bright,
But never a wound or scar had he;
With hempen bands they bound him tight,
Both hands and feet, on the Nine-stane lee.

That wizard accurst, the bands he burst;
They moulder'd at his magic spell;
And neck and heel, in the forged steel,
They bound him against the charms of hell.

That wizard accurst, the bands he burst;
No forged steel his charms could bide;
Then up bespake him true Thomas,
'We'll bind him yet, whate'er betide.'

. . . . .

The black spae-book from his breast he took,
And turn'd the leaves with a curious hand;
No ropes, did he find, the wizard could bind,
But threefold ropes of sifted sand.

They sifted the sand from the Nine-stane burn,
And shaped the ropes sae curiouslie;
But the ropes would neither twist nor twine,
For Thomas true and his gramarye."

How the wizard's spells were overcome.

At last, so the ballad proceeds to tell, when even the hopeful plan of binding the enchanter with ropes of twisted sand, reinforced by barley chaff, had failed disappointingly, true Thomas discovered from his black spae-book that the only way of quashing the wizard's spells was by boiling him in lead. So they heated a cauldron, wrapped the foul magician in a sheet of lead, and heaved him in. This had the desired effect; the body and bones of Lord Soulis were soon melted down, and that was the miserable end of the enchanter.[1]

Lord Soulis, an historical personage, though the popular tradition of his death is fabulous.

The ruins of the wicked lord's stronghold, the Castle of Hermitage, still stand in a hollow of the hills of Liddesdale, and the circle of stones where he is said to have been boiled alive is still pointed out on a declivity which descends from the hills to the Water of Hermitage and bears the name of the Nine-stane Rig. Yet the story of his tragic death, like that of his invulnerability, has no foundation in fact. William, Lord Soulis, a powerful baron and the owner of great estates, entered into a conspiracy against King Robert the Bruce, but the plot was discovered by the Countess of Strathern, and the traitor was seized at Berwick. Having confessed his guilt in full Parliament he received his life at the king's hand, but his domains were forfeited, and he was confined in the castle of Dumbarton, a strong fortress which crowns the summit of a huge isolated rock situated at the point

[1] Sir Walter Scott, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, iv. 244, 255-257 (in the collected edition of Scott's Poetical Works, Edinburgh, 1833).

where the Vale of the Leven joins the Vale of the Clyde. There the traitor died in prison, and with him the noble family of Soulis ceased to make a figure in Scottish history.[1] This instance serves to show how rash it may be to infer the mythical character of the hero of a folk-tale from the mythical nature of the incidents which are related of him. The magical powers ascribed to Lord Soulis and the traditional manner of his death, in spite of the circumstantial local evidence by which the tradition appears to be supported, are purely fabulous; yet the man was an historical personage, who played a notable part in his time, and for that very reason became the theme of fable, popular fancy weaving its many-coloured web about his tragic figure, so as to disguise and almost obliterate its true outlines. His example warns us against discrediting the historical reality of Samson on account of the unhistorical elements in his story.

Ancient Greek stories like those of Samson and Delilah.

Tales like that of Samson and Delilah were current in the legendary lore of ancient Greece. It is said that Nisus, king of Megara, had a purple or golden hair on the middle of his head, and that he was doomed to die whenever that hair should be plucked out. When Megara was besieged by the Cretans, the king's daughter Scylla fell in love with Minos, their king, and pulled out the fatal hair from her father's head. So he died.[2] According to one account it was not the life but the strength of Nisus that was in his golden hair; when it was pulled out, he grew weak and was slain by Minos.[3] In this form the story of Nisus resembles still more closely the story of Samson. Again, Poseidon is said to have made Pterelaus immortal by giving him a golden hair on his head. But when Taphos, the home of Pterelaus was besieged by Amphitryo, the daughter of Pterelaus fell in love with Amphitryo and killed her father by plucking out the golden hair with which his life was bound up.[4] In a modern Greek folk-tale a man's strength

[1] Sir Walter Scott, *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (Edinburgh, 1833), iv. 239 *sqq.*

[2] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, iii. 15. 8; Aeschylus, *Choeph.* 612 *sqq.*; Pausanias, i. 19. 4; *Ciris*, 116 *sqq.*; Ovid, *Metamorph.* viii. 8 *sqq.*

[3] J. Tzetzes, *Scholia on Lycophron*, 650.

[4] Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, ii. 4. 5 and 7.

lies in three golden hairs on his head. When his mother pulls them out, he grows weak and timid and is slain by his enemies.[1] Another Greek story, in which we may perhaps detect a reminiscence of Nisus and Scylla, relates how a certain king, who was the strongest man of his time, had three long hairs on his breast. But when he went to war with another king, and his own treacherous wife had cut off the three hairs, he became the weakest of men.[2]

Parallels to the story of Samson and Delilah in Slavonic and Celtic folk-lore.

The story how Samson was befooled by his false leman Delilah into betraying the secret of his strength has close parallels in Slavonic and Celtic folk-lore, with this difference, however, that in the Slavonic and Celtic tales the strength or the life of the hero is said to reside, not in his hair, but in some external object such as an egg or a bird. Thus a Russian story relates how a certain warlock called Kashtshei or Koshchei the Deathless carried off a princess and kept her prisoner in his golden castle. However, a prince made up to her one day as she was walking alone and disconsolate in the castle garden, and cheered by the prospect of escaping with him she went to the warlock and coaxed him with false and flattering words, saying, "My dearest friend, tell me, I pray you, will you never die?" "Certainly not," says he. "Well," says she, "and where is your death? Is it in your dwelling?" "To be sure it is," says he, "it is in the broom under the threshold." Thereupon the princess seized the broom and threw it on the fire, but although the broom burned, the deathless Koshchei remained alive; indeed not so much as a hair of him was singed. Balked in her first attempt, the artful hussy pouted and said, "You do not love me true, for you have not told me where your death is; yet I am not angry, but love you with all my heart." With these fawning words she besought the warlock to tell her truly where his death was. So he laughed and said, "Why

Russian story of Koshchei the Deathless, whose death was in an egg.

[1] J. G. von Hahn, *Griechische und albanesische Märchen* (Leipsic, 1864), i. 217; a similar story, *op. cit.* ii. 282.

[2] B. Schmidt, *Griechische Märchen, Sagen und Volkslieder* (Leipsic, 1877), pp. 91 *sq.* The same writer found in the island of Zacynthus a belief that the whole strength of the ancient Greeks resided in three hairs on their breasts, and that it vanished whenever these hairs were cut; but if the hairs were allowed to grow again their strength returned (B. Schmidt, *Das Volksleben der Neugriechen*, Leipsic, 1871, p. 206). Similarly the strength of Samson is said to have returned as his hair grew again after being cut (Judges xvi. 22 *sqq.*).

do you wish to know? Well then, out of love I will tell you where it lies. In a certain field there stand three green oaks, and under the roots of the largest oak is a worm, and if ever this worm is found and crushed, I shall die." When the princess heard these words, she went straight to her lover and told him all; and he searched till he found the oaks and dug up the worm and crushed it. Then he hurried to the warlock's castle, but only to learn that the warlock was still alive. Then the princess fell to wheedling and coaxing Koshchei once more, and this time, overcome by her wiles, he opened his heart to her and told her the truth. "My death," said he, "is far from here and hard to find, on the wide ocean. In that sea is an island, and on the island grows a green oak, and beneath the oak is an iron chest, and in the chest is a small basket, and in the basket is a hare, and in the hare is a duck, and in the duck is an egg; and he who finds the egg and breaks it, kills me at the same time." The prince naturally procured the fateful egg and with it in his hands he confronted the deathless warlock. The monster would have killed him, but the prince began to squeeze the egg. At that the warlock shrieked with pain, and turning to the false princess, who stood smirking and smiling, "Was it not out of love for you," said he, "that I told you where my death was? And is this the return you make to me?" With that he grabbed at his sword, which hung from a peg on the wall; but before he could reach it, the prince had crushed the egg, and sure enough the deathless warlock found his death at the same moment.[1]

Another version of the story of Koshchei the Deathless.

In another version of the same story, when the cunning warlock deceives the traitress by telling her that his death is in the broom, she gilds the broom, and at supper the warlock sees it shining under the threshold and asks her sharply, "What's that?" "Oh," says she, "you see how I honour you." "Simpleton!" says he, "I was joking. My death is out there fastened to the oak fence." So next day, when the warlock was out, the prince came and gilded the whole fence; and in the evening, when the warlock was at supper, he looked out of the window and saw the fence glistering

[1] Anton Dietrich, *Russian Popular Tales* (London, 1857), pp. 21-24.

like gold. "And pray what may that be?" said he to the princess. "You see," said she, "how I respect you. If you are dear to me, dear too is your death. That is why I have gilded the fence in which your death resides." The speech pleased the warlock, and in the fulness of his heart he revealed to her the fatal secret of the egg. When the prince, with the help of some friendly animals, obtained possession of the egg, he put it in his bosom and repaired to the warlock's house. The warlock himself was sitting at the window in a very gloomy frame of mind; and when the prince appeared and showed him the egg, the light grew dim in the warlock's eyes, and he became all of a sudden very meek and mild. But when the prince began to play with the egg and to throw it from one hand to the other, the deathless Koshchei staggered from one corner of the room to the other, and when the prince broke the egg Koshchei the Deathless fell down and died.[1]

Serbian story of a warlock called True Steel, whose strength was in a bird.

A Serbian story relates how a certain warlock called True Steel carried off a prince's wife and kept her shut up in his cave. But the prince contrived to get speech of her, and told her that she must persuade True Steel to reveal to her where his strength lay. So when True Steel came home, the prince's wife said to him, "Tell me, now, where is your great strength?" He answered, "My wife, my strength is in my sword." Then she began to pray and turned to his sword. When True Steel saw that, he laughed and said, "O foolish woman! my strength is not in my sword, but in my bow and arrows." Then she turned towards the bow and arrows and prayed. But True Steel said, "I see, my wife, you have a clever teacher who has taught you to find out where my strength lies. I could almost say that your husband is living, and it is he who teaches you." But she assured him that nobody had taught her. When she found he had deceived her again, she waited for some days and then asked him again about the secret of his strength. He answered, "Since you think so much of my strength, I will tell you truly where it is. Far away from here there is a very high mountain; in the mountain there is a fox; in the

[1] Jeremiah Curtin, *Myths and Folk-tales of the Russians, Western Slavs, and Magyars* (London, 1891), pp. 119-122.

fox there is a heart; in the heart there is a bird, and in this bird is my strength. It is no easy task, however, to catch the fox, for she can transform herself into a multitude of creatures." Next day, when True Steel went forth from the cave, the prince came and learned from his wife the true secret of the warlock's strength. So away he hied to the mountain, and there, though the fox, or rather the vixen, turned herself into various shapes, he contrived, with the help of some friendly eagles, falcons, and dragons, to catch and kill her. Then he took out the fox's heart, and out of the heart he took the bird and burned it in a great fire. At that very moment True Steel fell down dead.[1]

Serbian story of a dragon whose strength was in a pigeon.

In another Serbian story we read how a dragon resided in a water-mill and ate up two king's sons, one after the other. The third son went out to seek his brothers, and coming to the water-mill he found nobody in it but an old woman. She revealed to him the dreadful character of the being that kept the mill, and how he had devoured the prince's two elder brothers, and she implored him to go away home before a like fate should overtake him. But he was both brave and cunning, and he said to her, "Listen well to what I am going to say to you. Ask the dragon whither he goes and where his great strength is; then kiss all that place where he tells you his strength is, as if you loved it dearly, till you find it out, and afterwards tell me when I come." So when the dragon came home the old woman began to question him, "Where in God's name have you been? Whither do you go so far? You will never tell me whither you go." The dragon replied, "Well, my dear old woman, I do go far." Then the old woman coaxed him, saying, "And why do you go so far? Tell me where your strength is. If I knew where your strength is, I don't know what I should do for love; I would kiss all that place." Thereupon the dragon smiled and said to her, "Yonder is my strength in that fire-place." Then the old woman began to kiss and fondle the fireplace; and the dragon on seeing it burst into a laugh. "Silly old woman," he said, "my strength is not there. It is

[1] Madame Csedomille Mijatovich, *Serbian Folk-lore*, edited by the Rev. W. Denton (London, 1874), pp. 167-172; F. S. Krauss, *Sagen und Märchen der Südslaven* (Leipsic, 1883–1884), i. 164-169.

in the tree-fungus in front of the house." Then the old woman began to fondle and kiss the tree; but the dragon laughed again and said to her, "Away, old woman! my strength is not there." "Then where is it?" asked the old woman. "My strength," said he, "is a long way off, and you cannot go thither. Far in another kingdom under the king's city is a lake; in the lake is a dragon; in the dragon is a boar; in the boar is a pigeon, and in the pigeon is my strength." The secret was out; so next morning, when the dragon went away from the mill to attend to his usual business of gobbling people up, the prince came to the old woman and she let him into the mystery of the dragon's strength. Needless to say that the prince contrived to make his way to the lake in the far country, where after a terrible tussle he slew the water-dragon and extracted the pigeon, in which was the strength of the other unscrupulous dragon who kept the mill. Having questioned the pigeon, and ascertained from it how to restore his two murdered brothers to life, the prince wrung the bird's neck, and no doubt the wicked dragon perished miserably the very same moment, though the story-teller has omitted to mention the fact.[1]

Celtic parallels. Islay story of a giant whose soul was in an egg.

Similar incidents occur in Celtic stories. Thus a tale, told by a blind fiddler in the island of Islay, relates how a giant carried off a king's wife and his two horses, and kept them in his den. But the horses attacked the giant and mauled him so that he could hardly crawl. He said to the queen, "If I myself had my soul to keep, those horses would have killed me long ago." "And where, my dear," said she, "is thy soul? By the books I will take care of it." "It is in the Bonnach stone," said he. So on the morrow when the giant went out, the queen set the Bonnach stone in order exceedingly. In the dusk of the evening the giant came back, and he said to the queen, "What made thee set the Bonnach stone in order like that?" "Because thy soul is in it," quoth she. "I perceive," said he, "that if thou didst know where my soul is, thou wouldst give it much respect." "That I would," said she. "It is not there," said he, "my soul is; it is in the threshold." On the morrow she set the

[1] A. H. Wratislaw, *Sixty Folk-Tales from exclusively Slavonic Sources* (London, 1889), pp. 224-231.

threshold in order finely, and when the giant returned he asked her, "What brought thee to set the threshold in order like that?" "Because thy soul is in it," said she. "I perceive," said he, "that if thou knewest where my soul is, thou wouldst take care of it." "That I would," said she. "It is not there that my soul is," said he. "There is a great flagstone under the threshold. There is a wether under the flag; there is a duck in the wether's belly, and an egg in the belly of the duck, and it is in the egg that my soul is." On the morrow when the giant was gone, they raised the flagstone and out came the wether. They opened the wether and out came the duck. They split the duck, and out came the egg. And the queen took the egg and crushed it in her hands, and at that very moment the giant, who was coming home in the dusk, fell down dead.[1]

Argyleshire story of a giant whose life was in a thorn of blackthorn.

Once more, in an Argyleshire story we read how a big giant, King of Sorcha, stole away the wife of the herdsman of Cruachan, and hid her in the cave in which he dwelt. But by the help of some obliging animals the herdsman contrived to discover the cave and his own lost wife in it. Fortunately the giant was not at home; so after giving her husband food to eat, she hid him under some clothes at the upper end of the cave. And when the giant came home he sniffed about and said, "The smell of a stranger is in the cave." But she said no, it was only a little bird she had roasted. "And I wish you would tell me," said she, "where you keep your life, that I might take good care of it." "It is in a grey stone over there," said he. So next day when he went away, she took the grey stone and dressed it well, and placed it in the upper end of the cave. When the giant came home in the evening he said to her, "What is it that you have dressed there?" "Your own life," said she, "and we must be careful of it." "I perceive that you are very fond of me, but it is not there," said he. "Where is it?" said she. "It is in a grey sheep on yonder hillside," said he. On the morrow, when he went away, she got the grey sheep, dressed it well, and placed it in the upper end of the cave. When he came home in the evening, he said, "What is it that you

[1] J. F. Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, New Edition (Paisley and London, 1890), i. 7-11.

have dressed there?" "Your own life, my love," said she. "It is not there as yet," said he. "Well!" said she, "you are putting me to great trouble taking care of it, and you have not told me the truth these two times." He then said, "I think that I may tell it to you now. My life is below the feet of the big horse in the stable. There is a place down there in which there is a small lake. Over the lake are seven grey hides, and over the hides are seven sods from the heath, and under all these are seven oak planks. There is a trout in the lake, and a duck in the belly of the trout, an egg in the belly of the duck, and a thorn of blackthorn inside of the egg, and till that thorn is chewed small I cannot be killed. Whenever the seven grey hides, the seven sods from the heath, and the seven oak planks are touched, I shall feel it wherever I shall be. I have an axe above the door, and unless all these are cut through with one blow of it, the lake will not be reached; and when it will be reached I shall feel it." Next day, when the giant had gone out hunting on the hill, the herdsman of Cruachan contrived, with the help of the same friendly animals, which had assisted him before, to get possession of the fateful thorn, and to chew it before the giant could reach him; and no sooner had he done so than the giant dropped stark and stiff, a corpse.[1]

Indian story of an ogre king of Gilgit whose soul was made of butter.

A story of the same sort is told by the natives of Gilgit in the highlands of North-Western India. They say that once on a time Gilgit was ruled by an ogre king named Shri Badat, who levied a tax of children on his subjects and had their flesh regularly served up to him at dinner. Hence he went by the surname of the Man-Eater. He had a daughter called Sakina or Miyo Khai, who used to spend the summer months at a pleasant spot high up in the mountains, while Gilgit sweltered in the sultry heat of the valley below. One day it chanced that a handsome prince named Shamsher was hunting in the mountains near the summer quarters of the princess, and being fatigued by the chase he and his men lay down to sleep beside a bubbling spring under the grateful shade of trees; for it was high noon and the sun was hot. As chance or fate would have it, a handmaid of the princess came just then to draw water at the spring, and

[1] Rev. D. MacInnes, *Folk and Hero Tales* (London, 1890), pp. 103-121.

seeing the strangers sleeping beside it she returned and reported the matter to her mistress. The princess was very angry at this intrusion on her chace, and caused the intruders to be brought before her. But at sight of the handsome prince, her anger fled; she entered into conversation with him, and though the day wore on to afternoon and evening, and the prince requested to be allowed to descend the mountains, the princess detained him, hanging on his lips as he recounted to her his adventures and deeds of valour. At last she could hide her feelings no longer; she told her love and offered him her hand. He accepted it not without hesitation, for he feared that her cruel father the king would never consent to her union with a stranger like himself. So they resolved to keep their marriage secret, and married they were that very night.

How the ogre's treacherous daughter wormed from him the secret of his soul.

But hardly had the prince won the hand of the princess than his ambition took a higher flight, and he aimed at making himself master of the kingdom. For that purpose he instigated his wife to murder her father and to raise a rebellion against him. Infatuated by her love of her husband, the princess consented to plot against her royal father's life. But there was an obstacle to the accomplishment of their design; for Shri Badat, the king, was a descendant of the giants, and as such had no fear of being attacked by sword or arrow, because these weapons could make neither scratch nor dint on his body, and nobody knew what his soul was made of. Accordingly the first thing the ambitious prince had to do was to learn the exact nature of his father-in-law's soul; and who so well able to worm the king's secret from him as his daughter? So one day, whether to gratify a whim or to prove his wife's fidelity, he told her that no sooner should the leaves of a certain tree fade and turn yellow than she should see her father no more. Well, that autumn—for summer was now passing—it chanced that the leaves of the tree faded and turned yellow earlier than usual; and at sight of the yellow leaves the princess, thinking that her father's last hour was come, and touched perhaps with remorse for the murder she had been revolving in her heart, went down the hill lamenting, and so returned to Gilgit. But in the castle, to her surprise, she found her

royal sire in the enjoyment of his usual robust health and cannibal appetite. Taken somewhat aback, she excused her abrupt and unexpected return from her summer quarters in the hills by saying that a holy man had foretold how with the fading leaves of a certain tree her dear father also would fade and die. "This very day," she said, "the leaves turned yellow, and I feared for you, and came to throw myself at your feet. But I thank God that the omen has not come true, and that the holy man has proved a false prophet." The paternal heart of the ogre was touched by this proof of filial affection, and he said, "O my affectionate daughter, nobody in the world can kill me, for nobody knows of what my soul is made. How can it be injured until some one knows its nature? It is beyond a man's power to inflict harm on my body." To this his daughter replied that her happiness depended on his life and safety, and as she was dearest to him in all the wide world, he ought not to fear to tell her the secret of his soul. If she only knew it, she would be able to forestall any evil omens, to guard against any threatened danger, and to prove her love by devoting herself to the safety of her kind father. Yet the wary ogre distrusted her, and, like Samson and the giants of the fairy tales, tried to put her off by many false or evasive answers. But at last, overcome by her importunity or mollified by her cajoleries, he revealed the fatal secret. He told her that his soul was made of butter, and that whenever she should see a great fire burning in or around the castle, she might know that his last day was come; for how could the butter of his soul hold out against the heat of the conflagration? Little did he wot that in saying this he was betraying himself into the hands of a weak woman and an ungrateful daughter who was plotting against his life.

How the treacherous daughter and her husband plotted to melt her father's soul of butter.

After passing a few days with her too confiding sire, the traitress returned to her abode in the hills, where she found her beloved spouse Shamsher anxiously expecting her. Very glad was he to learn the secret of the king's soul, for he was resolved to spare no pains in taking his father-in-law's life, and he now saw the road clear to the accomplishment of his design. In the prosecution of the plot he counted on the active assistance of the king's own subjects,

who were eager to rid themselves of the odious ogre and so to save the lives of their remaining children from his ravening maw. Nor was the prince deceived in his calculation; for on learning that a deliverer was at hand, the people readily gave in their adhesion to him, and in collusion with them the plot was laid for bearding the monster in his den. The plan had the merit of extreme simplicity. A great fire was to be kindled round about the royal castle, and in the heat of it the king's soul of butter was expected to melt away and dissolve. A few days before the plot was to be put into execution, the prince sent down his wife to her father at Gilgit, with strict injunctions to keep their secret and so to lull the doating ogre into a sense of false security. All was now ready. At dead of night the people turned out of their homes with torches and bundles of wood in their hands. As they drew near the castle, the king's soul of butter began to feel uneasy; a restlessness came over him, and late as the hour was he sent out his daughter to learn the source of his uneasiness. The undutiful and faithless woman accordingly went out into the night, and after tarrying a while, to let the rebels with their torches draw nearer, she returned to the castle and attempted to reassure her father by telling him that his fears were vain, and that there was nothing the matter. But now the presentiment of coming evil in the king's mind was too strong to be reasoned away by his wheedling daughter; he went out from his chamber himself only to see the darkness of night lit up by the blaze of fires surrounding the castle. There was no time to hesitate or loiter. His resolution was soon taken. He leaped into the air and winged his way in the direction of Chotur Khan, a region of snow and ice among the lofty mountains which encircle Gilgit. There he hid himself under a great glacier, and there, since his butter soul could not melt in ice, he remains down to this day. Yet still the people of Gilgit believe that he will come back one day to rule over them and to devour their children with redoubled fury; hence every year on a night in November—the anniversary of the day when he was driven from Gilgit—they keep great fires burning all through the hours of darkness in order to repel his ghost, if he should attempt to return. On that night no

The annual commemoration of the ogre's flight.

one would dare to sleep; so to while away the time the people dance and sing about the blazing bonfires.[1]

Resemblance of the Indian to the Slavonic and Celtic tales and to the Samson legend.

The general conformity of this Indian story to the Samson legend and the Slavonic and Celtic tales is sufficiently obvious. Its resemblance to them would probably be still closer if the story-teller had recorded the false and evasive answers which the ogre gave to his daughter in regard to the secret of his soul; for on the analogy of the Hebrew, Slavonic, and Celtic parallels we may suppose that the wily monster attempted to deceive her by pretending that his soul was stowed away in things with which in reality it had no connexion. Perhaps one of his answers was that his soul was in the leaves of a certain tree, and that when they turned yellow it would be a sign of his death, though as the story now runs this false prediction is put in the mouth of a third person instead of in that of the ogre himself.

But in the Celtic, Slavonic, and Indian stories the parts of the hero and the villain are transposed: we detest the betrayed warlock and applaud his betrayer.

While these Slavonic, Celtic, and Indian tales resemble the story of Samson and Delilah in their general scheme or plot, they differ from it in at least one important respect. For in the Samson story the reader's sympathy is all enlisted on the side of the betrayed warlock, who is represented in an amiable light as a patriot and champion of his people: we admire his marvellous feats; we pity his sufferings and death; we abhor the treachery of the artful hussy whose false protestations of affection have brought these unmerited calamities on her lover. On the other hand, in the Slavonic, Celtic, and Indian stories the dramatic interest of the situation is exactly reversed. The betrayed warlock is represented in a very unamiable light as a wretch who abuses his great power for wicked purposes; we detest his crimes, we rejoice at his downfall, and we applaud or condone the cunning of the woman who betrays him to his doom, because in doing so she merely avenges a great wrong which he has done to her or to a whole people. Thus in the two different renderings of the same general theme the parts of the villain and the victim are transposed: in the one rendering

[1] Ghulam Muhammad, "Festivals and Folklore of Gilgit," *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. i. No. 7 (Calcutta, 1905), pp. 114 *sq.*, 115-118. I have considerably abridged the story.

the part of the innocent victim is taken by the warlock, and the part of the artful villain by the woman; in the other rendering it is the warlock who figures as the artful villain, and it is the woman who plays the part of the innocent victim, or at all events, as in the Indian tale, of the fond wife and national deliverer. There can be little doubt that if we had the Philistine version of the story of Samson and Delilah, we should find in it the parts of the villain and the victim transposed: we should see Samson figuring as the unscrupulous villain who robbed and murdered the defenceless Philistines, and we should see Delilah appearing as the innocent victim of his brutal violence, who by her quick wit and high courage contrived at once to avenge her own wrongs and to deliver her people from the monster who had so long and so cruelly afflicted them. It is thus that in the warfare of nations and of factions the parts of the hero and the villain are apt to shift according to the standpoint from which we view them: seen from one side the same man will appear as the whitest of heroes; seen from the other side he will appear as the blackest of villains; from the one side he will be greeted with showers of roses, from the other side he will be pelted with volleys of stones. We may almost say that every man who has made a great figure in the turbulent scenes of history is a harlequin, whose parti-coloured costume differs according as you look at him from the front or the back, from the right or the left. His friends and his foes behold him from opposite sides, and they naturally see only that particular hue of his coat which happens to be turned towards them. It is for the impartial historian to contemplate these harlequins from every side and to paint them in their coats of many colours, neither altogether so white as they appeared to their friends nor altogether so black as they seemed to their enemies.

The harlequins of history.

CHAPTER VII

THE BUNDLE OF LIFE

THE traveller who, quitting the cultivated lands of central Judea, rides eastwards towards the Dead Sea, traverses at first a series of rolling hills and waterless valleys covered by broom and grass. But as he pursues his way onward the scenery changes; the grass and thistles disappear, and he gradually passes into a bare and arid region, where the wide expanse of brown or yellow sand, of crumbling limestone, and of scattered shingle is only relieved by thorny shrubs and succulent creepers. Not a tree is to be seen; not a human habitation, not a sign of life meets the eye for mile after mile. Ridge follows ridge in monotonous and seemingly endless succession, all equally white, steep, and narrow, their sides furrowed by the dry beds of innumerable torrents, and their crests looming sharp and ragged against the sky above him as the traveller ascends from the broad flats of soft white marl, interspersed with flints, which divide each isolated ridge from the one beyond it. The nearer slopes of these desolate hills look as if they were torn and rent by waterspouts; the more distant heights present the aspect of gigantic dustheaps. In some places the ground gives out a hollow sound under the horse's tread; in others the stones and sand slip from beneath the animal's hoofs; and in the frequent gullies the rocks glow with a furnace heat under the pitiless sun which beats down on them out of the cloudless firmament. Here and there, as we proceed eastward, the desolation of the landscape is momentarily lightened by a glimpse of the Dead Sea, its waters of a deep blue appearing in a hollow of the hills and con-

The wilderness of Judea.

trasting refreshingly with the dull drab colouring of the desert foreground. When the last ridge is surmounted and he stands on the brink of the great cliffs, a wonderful panorama bursts upon the spectator. Some two thousand feet below him lies the Dead Sea, visible in its whole length from end to end, its banks a long succession of castellated crags, bastion beyond bastion, divided by deep gorges, with white capes running out into the calm blue water, while beyond the lake rise the mountains of Moab to melt in the far distance into the azure of the sky. If he has struck the lake above the springs of Engedi, he finds himself on the summit of an amphitheatre of nearly vertical cliffs, down which a rugged winding track, or rather staircase, cut in the face of the precipice, leads to a little horse-shoe shaped plain sloping to the water's edge. It is necessary to dismount and lead the horses carefully down this giddy descent, the last of the party picking their steps very warily, for a single slip might dislodge a stone, which, hurtling down the crag, and striking on the travellers below, would precipitate them to the bottom. At the foot of the cliffs the copious warm fountain of Engedi, "the spring of the kid," bursts in a foaming cascade from the rock amid a verdurous oasis of luxuriant semi-tropical vegetation, which strikes the wayfarer all the more by contrast with the dreary waterless wilderness through which he has been toiling for many hours. That wilderness is what the ancient Hebrews called Jeshimmon, or desolation, the wilderness of Judea. From the bitter but brilliant water of the Dead Sea it stretches right up into the heart of the country, to the roots of the Mount of Olives, to within two hours of the gates of Hebron, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem.[1]

David and Abigail.

To these dismal wilds the hunted David fled for refuge from the pursuit of his implacable enemy Saul.[2] While he was in hiding there with the band of broken men he had gathered round him, he was visited by Abigail, the wise and

[1] (Sir) George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London, 1894), pp. 269 *sqq.*, 342 *sqq.*; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, Fourth Edition (London, 1882), pp. 193 *sqq.*; *id.*, *The Land of Moab*, Second Edition (London, 1874), pp. 23 *sqq.*; R. C. Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, New Edition (London, 1885), pp. 262 *sqq.*

[2] 1 Samuel xxiii. 14 *sq.*, 24 *sq.*, 29, xxiv. 1.

beautiful wife of the rich sheep-farmer Nabal, whom the gallant outlaw had laid under a deep obligation by not stealing his sheep. Insensible of the services thus rendered to him by the caterans, the surly boor refused with contumely a request, couched in the most polite terms, which the captain of the band had sent in for the loan of provisions. The insult touched the captain's nice sense of honour to the quick, and he was marching over the hills at the head of four hundred pretty fellows, every man of them with his broadsword buckled at his side, and was making straight for the farm, when the farmer's wife met him on the moor. She had soft words to soothe the ruffled pride of the angry chieftain, and, better perhaps than words, a train of asses laden with meat and drink for the sharp-set brigands. David was melted. The beauty of the woman, her gentle words, the sight of the asses with their panniers, all had their effect. He received the wife, pleading for her husband, with the utmost courtesy, promised his protection, not without dark hints of the sight that the sun would have seen at the farm next morning if she had not met him, and so dismissed her with a blessing. The word was given. The outlaws faced to the right-about, and, followed no doubt by the asses with their panniers, marched off the way they had come. As she watched those stalwart, sunburnt figures stepping out briskly till the column disappeared over the nearest ridge, Abigail may have smiled and sighed. Then, turning homeward, she hastened with a lighter heart to the house where her boorish husband and his hinds, little wotting of what had passed on the hills, were drinking deep and late after the sheepshearing. That night over the wine she wisely said nothing. But next morning, when he was sober, she told him, and his heart died within him. The shock to his nervous system, or perhaps something stronger, was too much for him. Within ten days he was a dead man, and after a decent interval the widow was over the hills and far away with the captain of the brigands.[1]

The meeting on the moor.

Among the compliments which the charming Abigail paid to the susceptible David at their first meeting, there is

The bundle of life.

[1] 1 Samuel xxv. 1-42.

one which deserves our attention. She said, "And though man be risen up to pursue thee, and to seek thy soul, yet the soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God; and the souls of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling."[1] No doubt the language is metaphorical, but to an English writer the metaphor is strange and obscure. It implies that the souls of living people could be tied up for safety in a bundle, and that, on the contrary, when the souls were those of enemies, the bundle might be undone and the souls scattered to the winds. Such an idea could hardly have occurred to a Hebrew even as a figure of speech, unless he were familiar with an actual belief that souls could thus be treated. To us, who conceive of a soul as immanent in its body so long as life lasts, the idea conveyed by the verse in question is naturally preposterous. But it would not be so to many peoples whose theory of life differs widely from ours. There is in fact a widespread belief among savages that the soul can be, and often is, extracted from the body during the lifetime of its owner without immediately causing his death. Commonly this is done by ghosts, demons, or evil-disposed persons, who have a grudge at a man and steal his soul for the purpose of killing him; for if they succeed in their fell intent and detain the truant soul long enough, the man will fall ill and die.[2] For that reason people who identify their souls with their shades or reflections are often in mortal terror of a camera, because they think that the photographer who has taken their likeness has abstracted their souls or shades along with it. To take a single instance out of a multitude. At a village on the lower Yukon River, in Alaska, an explorer had set up his camera to get a picture of the Eskimo as they were moving

Wide-spread belief that souls can be extracted from their bodies in the lifetime of their owners.

[1] 1 Samuel xxv. 29. I have to thank my dear and lamented friend, the late Professor J. H. Moulton, D.D., for directing my attention to this passage and suggesting what I believe to be its true interpretation. The same expression "bundle of life" (צרור חיים) is applied to a faithful friend in the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus vi. 16, where צרור ("bundle") ought not, with some editors, to be changed into צרי ("balm"). See Professor A. A. Bevan, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1899, p. 140.

[2] *Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, pp. 30 *sqq.* (*The Golden Bough*, Third Edition, Part ii.); A. C. Kruijt, *Het Animisme in den Indischen Archipel* (The Hague, 1906), pp. 77 *sqq.*

about among their houses. While he was focussing the instrument, the headman of the village came up and insisted on peeping under the cloth. Being allowed to do so he gazed agog for a minute at the moving figures on the ground-glass; then jerking his head from under the cloth he bellowed out to his people, "He has got all your shades in this box." A panic ensued among the group, and in a twinkling they disappeared helter-skelter into their houses.[1] On this theory a camera or a packet of photographs is a box or bundle of souls, packed ready for transport like sardines in a tin.

Souls extracted from their bodies at critical seasons in order to keep them out of harm's way.

But sometimes souls are extracted from their bodies with a kindly intention. The savage seems to think that nobody can die properly so long as his soul remains intact, whether in the body or out of the body; hence he infers that if he can contrive to draw out his soul and stow it away in some place where nothing can injure it, he will be for all practical purposes immortal so long as his soul remains unharmed and undisturbed in its haven of refuge. Hence in time of danger the wary savage will sometimes carefully extract his own soul or the soul of a friend and leave it, so to say, at deposit account in some safe place till the danger is past and he can reclaim his spiritual property. For example, many people regard the removal to a new house as a crisis fraught with peril to their souls; hence in Minahassa, a district of Celebes, at such critical times a priest collects the souls of the whole family in a bag, and keeps them there till the danger is over, when he restores them to their respective owners.[2] Again, in Southern Celebes, when a woman's time is near, the messenger who goes to fetch the doctor or midwife takes with him a chopping-knife or something else made of iron. The thing, whatever it is, represents the woman's soul, which at this dangerous time is believed to be safer outside of her body than in it. Hence the doctor must take great care of the thing,

[1] E. W. Nelson, "The Eskimo about Behring Straits," *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, Part i. (Washington, 1899) p. 422.

[2] P. N. Wilken, "Bijdragen tot de kennis van de zeden en gewoonten der Alfoeren in de Minahassa," *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, vii. (1863) pp. 146 *sq.*

for were it lost the woman's soul would with it be lost also. So he keeps it in his house till the confinement is over, when he gives back the precious object in return for a fee.[1] In the Kei Islands a hollowed-out coco-nut, split in two and carefully pieced together, may sometimes be seen hanging up. This is a receptacle in which the soul of a newly-born infant is kept lest it should fall a prey to demons. For in those parts the soul does not permanently lodge in its tabernacle of clay, until the clay has taken a firm consistency. The Eskimo of Alaska adopt a similar precaution for the soul of a sick child. The medicine-man conjures it into an amulet and then stows the amulet in his medicine-bag, where, if anywhere, the soul should be out of harm's way.[2] In some parts of South-Eastern New Guinea, when a woman walks abroad carrying her baby in a bag, she "must tie a long streamer of vine of some kind to her skirt, or better still to the baby's bag, so that it trails behind her on the ground. For should, by chance, the child's spirit wander from the body it must have some means of crawling back from the ground, and what so convenient as a vine trailing on the path?"[3]

Bundles of sacred sticks and stones (*churinga*) with which the spirits of the Central Australian aborigines are thought to be closely associated.

But perhaps the closest analogy to the "bundle of life" is furnished by the bundles of *churinga*, that is, flattened and elongated stones and sticks, which the Arunta and other tribes of Central Australia keep with the greatest care and secrecy in caves and crevices of the rocks. Each of these mysterious stones or sticks is intimately associated with the spirit of a member of the clan, living or dead; for as soon as the spirit of a child enters into a woman to be born, one of these holy sticks or stones is dropped on the spot where the mother felt her womb quickened. Directed by her, the father searches for the stick or stone of his child, and having found it, or carved it out of the nearest hard-wood tree, he delivers it to the headman of the district, who deposits it with the rest in the sacred store-house among the rocks. These precious sticks and stones, closely bound up with the spirits of all the members of the clan,

[1] B. F. Matthes, *Bijdragen tot de Ethnologie van Zuid-Celebes* (The Hague, 1873), p. 54.

[2] J. A. Jacobsen, *Reisen in die Inselwelt des Banda-Meeres* (Berlin, 1896), p. 199.

[3] Henry Newton, *In Far New Guinea* (London, 1914), p. 186.

are often carefully tied up in bundles. They constitute the most sacred possession of the tribe, and the places where they are deposited are skilfully screened from observation, the entrance to the caves being blocked up with stones arranged so naturally as to disarm suspicion. Not only the spot itself but its surroundings are sacred. The plants and trees that grow there are never touched: the wild animals that find their way thither are never molested. And if a man fleeing from his enemies or from the avenger of blood succeeds in reaching the sanctuary, he is safe so long as he remains within its bounds. The loss of their *churinga*, as they call the sacred sticks and stones thus associated with the spirits of all the living and all the dead members of the community, is the most serious evil that can befall a tribe. Robbed of them by inconsiderate white men, the natives have been known to stay in camp for a fortnight, weeping and wailing over their loss and plastering their body with white pipeclay, the emblem of mourning for the dead.[1]

In these sacred sticks and stones the ancestors of the Central Australian aborigines seem formerly to have deposited their spirits.

In these beliefs and practices of the Central Australians with regard to the *churinga* we have, as Messrs. Spencer and Gillen justly observe, "a modification of the idea which finds expression in the folklore of so many peoples, and according to which primitive man, regarding his soul as a concrete object, imagines that he can place it in some secure spot apart, if needs be, from his body, and thus, if the latter be in any way destroyed, the spirit part of him still persists unharmed."[2] Not that the Arunta of the present day believe these sacred sticks and stones to be the actual receptacles of their spirits in the sense that the destruction of one of the sticks or stones would of necessity involve the destruction of the man, woman, or child whose spirit is associated with it. But in their traditions we meet with clear traces of a belief that their ancestors did really deposit their spirits in these sacred objects. For example, we are told that some men of the Wild Cat totem kept their spirits in their

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), pp. 128-136. Compare *id.*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), pp. 257-282.

[2] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 137.

churinga, which they used to hang up on a sacred pole in the camp when they went out to hunt; and on their return from the chase they would take down the *churinga* from the pole and carry them about as before.[1] The intention of thus hanging up the *churinga* on a pole when they went out hunting may have been to put their souls in safe keeping till they came back.

Analogy between a bundle of these sacred sticks and stones and "the bundle of life."

Thus there is fair ground to think that the bundles of sacred sticks and stones, which are still treasured so carefully in secret places by the Arunta and other tribes of Central Australia, were formerly believed to house the souls of every member of the community. So long as these bundles remained securely tied up in the sanctuary, so long, might it be thought, was it well with the souls of all the people; but once open the bundles and scatter their precious contents to the winds, and the most fatal consequences would follow. It would be rash to assert that the primitive Semites ever kept their souls for safety in sticks and stones which they deposited in caves and crannies of their native wilderness; but it is not rash to affirm that some such practice would explain in an easy and natural way the words of Abigail to the hunted outlaw, "And though man be risen up to pursue thee, and to seek thy soul, yet the soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with the Lord thy God; and the souls of thine enemies, them shall he sling out, as from the hollow of a sling."

Ezekiel's denunciation of the women who hunt and catch souls.

Be that as it may, the Hebrews would seem even down to comparatively late times to have been familiar with a form of witchcraft which aimed at catching and detaining the souls of living persons with the intent to do them grievous hurt. The witches who practised this black art were formally denounced by the prophet Ezekiel in the following terms:—

"And thou, son of man, set thy face against the daughters of thy people, which prophesy out of their own heart; and prophesy thou against them, and say, Thus saith the Lord God: Woe to the women that sew fillets upon all elbows, and make kerchiefs for the head of *persons*

[1] (Sir) Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 138.

of every stature to hunt souls! Will ye hunt the souls of my people, and save souls alive for yourselves? And ye have profaned me among my people for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread, to slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive that should not live, by your lying to my people that hearken unto lies. Wherefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold I am against your fillets, wherewith ye hunt the souls, and I will tear them from your arms; and I will let the souls which ye hunt go free like birds. Your kerchiefs also will I tear, and deliver my people out of your hand, and they shall be no more in your hand to be hunted; and ye shall know that I am the Lord."[1]

The art of hunting and catching souls in traps and snares practised in various parts of the world.

The nefarious practices of these women, which the prophet denounces, apparently consisted in attempts to catch stray souls in fillets and cloths, and so to kill some people by keeping their souls in durance vile, and to save the lives of others, probably of sick people, by capturing their vagabond souls and restoring them to their bodies. Similar devices have been and still are adopted for the same purpose by sorcerers and witches in many parts of the world. For example, Fijian chiefs used to whisk away the souls of criminals in scarves, whereupon the poor wretches, deprived of this indispensable part of their persons, used to pine and die.[2] The sorcerers of Danger Island, in the Pacific, caught the souls of sick people in snares, which they set up near the houses of the sufferers, and watched till a soul came fluttering into the trap and was entangled in its meshes, after which the death of the patient was, sooner or later, inevitable. The snares were made of stout cinet with loops of various sizes adapted to catch souls of all sizes, whether

Trapping souls in Danger Island.

[1] Ezekiel xiii. 17-21. Many years ago my friend W. Robertson Smith suggested to me the true interpretation of this passage, which seems to have escaped the commentators. Robertson Smith's explanation is accepted by A. Lods, *La Croyance à la Vie Future et le Culte des Morts dans l'Antiquité Israélite* (Paris, 1906), i. 47 *sq.* In verse 20, following I. W. Rothstein (in R. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, ii. 761), I read בָּם for שָׁם ("there") and omit the first לִפְרֹחוֹת ("like birds") as a doublet of the second, if indeed both should not be omitted as a gloss. The word (פָּרַח) is Aramaic, not Hebrew. Further, for אֶת נְפָשׁוֹת ("the souls," an unheard-of plural of נֶפֶשׁ) I read אֹתָן חָפְשִׁים ("them free") with Cornill and other critics.

[2] Th. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*, Second Edition (London, 1860), i. 250.

Trapping souls in West Africa.

large or small, whether fat or thin.[1] Among the negroes of West Africa "witches are continually setting traps to catch the soul that wanders from the body when a man is sleeping; and when they have caught this soul, they tie it up over the canoe fire and its owner sickens as the soul shrivels. This is merely a regular line of business, and not an affair of individual hate or revenge. The witch does not care whose dream-soul gets into the trap, and will restore it on payment. Also witch-doctors, men of unblemished professional reputation, will keep asylums for lost souls, *i.e.* souls who have been out wandering and found on their return to their body that their place had been filled up by a Sisa, a low-class soul. . . . These doctors keep souls, and administer them to patients who are short of the article."[2] Among the Baoules of the Ivory Coast it happened once that a chief's soul was extracted by the magic of an enemy, who succeeded in shutting it up in a box. To recover it, two men held a garment of the sufferer, while a witch performed certain enchantments. After a time she declared that the soul was now in the garment, which was accordingly rolled up and hastily wrapped about the invalid for the purpose of restoring his spirit to him.[3] Malay wizards catch the souls of women whom they love in the folds of their turbans, and then go about with the dear souls in their girdles by day and sleep with them under their pillows by night.[4] Among the Toradjas of Central Celebes the priest who accompanied an armed force on an expedition used to wear a string of sea-shells hanging down over his breast and back for the purpose of catching the souls of the enemy; the shells were branched and hooked, and it was supposed that, once the souls were conjured into the shells, the branches and hooks would prevent them from escaping. The way in which the priest set and baited this soul-trap was as follows. When the

Trapping souls in Celebes.

[1] W. W. Gill, *Myths and Songs from the South Pacific* (London, 1876), p. 171; *id.*, *Life in the Southern Isles* (London, N.D.), pp. 181 *sqq.* Cinet is cordage made from the dried fibre of coco-nut husk. See Th. Williams, *Fiji and the Fijians*,[2] i. 69.

[2] Miss Mary H. Kingsley, *Travels in West Africa* (London, 1897), pp. 461 *sq.*

[3] Maurice Delafosse, "Sur des traces probables de civilisation Égyptienne et d'hommes de race blanche à la Côte d'Ivoire," *L'Anthropologie*, xi. (1900) p. 558.

[4] W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic* (London, 1900), pp. 576 *sq.*

warriors had entered the hostile territory, the priest went by night to the village which they intended to attack, and there, close by the entrance, he laid down his string of shells on the path so as to form a circle, and inside of the circle he buried an egg and the guts of a fowl, from which omens had been drawn before the troop set out from their own land. Then the priest took up the string of shells and waved it seven times over the spot, calling quietly on the souls of the enemy and saying, "Oh, soul of So-and-So," mentioning the name of one of the inhabitants of the village, "come, tread on my fowl; thou art guilty, thou hast done wrong, come!" Then he waited, and if the string of shells gave out a tinkling sound, it was a sign that the soul of an enemy had really come and was held fast by the shells. Next day the man, whose soul had thus been ensnared, would be drawn, in spite of himself, to the spot where the foes who had captured his soul were lying in wait, and thus he would fall an easy prey to their weapons.[1]

Hebrew witches caught souls in kerchiefs.

Such practices may serve to explain those proceedings of the Hebrew witches against which Ezekiel fulminated. These abandoned women seem to have caught vagrant souls in kerchiefs which they threw over the heads of their victims, and to have detained their spiritual captives in fillets which they sewed to their own elbows.

"Houses of the soul" denounced by Isaiah.

Thus the Hebrews apparently retained down to historical times the conception of the soul as a separable thing, which can be removed from a man's body in his lifetime, either by the wicked art of witches, or by the owner's voluntary act in order to deposit it for a longer or shorter time in a place of safety. If one great prophet reveals to us the Hebrew witch at her infernal business of decoying the souls of others, another great prophet perhaps affords us a glimpse of a fine lady of Jerusalem carrying her own soul about with her in a little casket. After describing, in a strain of Puritan invective and scorn, the haughty daughters of Zion who tripped about with languishing eyes, mincing steps, and tinkling feet, Isaiah proceeds to give a long catalogue of the jewels and trinkets, the robes and shawls, the

[1] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 233 *sq.*, 236 *sq.*

veils and turbans, all the finery and frippery of these fashionable and luxurious dames.[1] In his list of feminine gauds he mentions "houses of the soul."[2] The expression thus literally translated is unique in the Old Testament. Modern translators and commentators, following Jerome, render it "perfume boxes," "scent-bottles," or the like.[3] But it may well be that these "houses of the soul" were amulets in which the soul of the wearer was supposed to lodge.[4] The commentators on the passage recognize that many of the trinkets in the prophet's list were probably charms, just as personal ornaments often are in the East to the present day.[5]

[1] Isaiah iii. 16-24.

[2] Isaiah iii. 20, בָּתֵּי הַנֶּפֶשׁ.

[3] "Perfume boxes" (English Revised Version). Similarly Kautsch, Dillmann, Duhm, Skinner, Whitehouse. Jerome's rendering in the Vulgate is *olfactoriola*.

[4] The Egyptians placed little models of houses, made of pottery, on the tombs for the souls of the dead to lodge in. Many of these miniature houses of the soul were discovered by Professor W. M. Flinders Petrie at Rifeh, in Upper Egypt. See W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Gizeh and Rifeh* (London, 1907), pp. 14-20, with Plates I., XV.-XXII. The hut-urns containing the ashes of the dead, which have been found in ancient Italian, German, and Danish graves, were probably in like manner intended to serve as houses of the soul. See W. Helbig, *Die Italiker in der Poebene* (Leipsic, 1879), p. 50; O. Schrader, *Reallexikon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (Strasburg, 1901), pp. 337, 339. The custom of erecting small huts or shrines for the souls of the dead appears to be common in African tribes. See J. Roscoe, "Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii. (1902) p. 41; *id.*, *The Baganda* (London, 1911), pp. 123, 286; *id.*, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 130, 229; L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), pp. 104, 189, 236, 269, 322, 356; E. Torday, *Camp and Tramp in African Wilds* (London, 1913), p. 137; Donald Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People* (London, 1914), p. 128; *The Last Journals of David Livingstone* (London, 1874), i. 156, 168, 353. Among the Iban or Sea Dyaks of Borneo it is customary to erect a miniature house on the grave one or two years after the death, and to place in this miniature house miniature hats, mats, and baskets for the use of the dead. See L. Nyuk, "Religious Rites and Customs of the Iban or Dyaks of Sarawak," *Anthropos*, i. (1906) pp. 171 *sq.* Among the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes, when a new house is being dedicated, the priestesses make a little model of a house for the souls of the dead and hang it up in a corner of the new dwelling. See N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 281. In the island of Gaman, off Western New Guinea, miniature houses are placed on the graves, and food is set beside them for the spirits of the dead. See J. W. van Hille, "Reizen in West-Nieuw-Guinea," *Tijdschrift van het Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, xxiii. (1906) p. 482. However, all such little houses for the souls of the dead stand on a different footing from houses for the souls of the living.

[5] Dillmann, Skinner, and Whitehouse, on Isaiah iii. 18 and 20. Compare B. Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*[2] (Leipsic, 1833–1838), i. 65, *s.v.* "Amulete." The peoples of the eastern horn of Africa (the Somali, Gallas, and Danakil), especially the Mohammedan part of them, wear many ornaments

The very word which follows "houses of the souls" in the text is rendered "amulets" in the English Revised Version; it is derived from a verb meaning "to whisper," "to charm."[1]

"Houses of the soul" perhaps scent-bottles.

But this view of the "houses of the soul" does not necessarily exclude their identification with scent-bottles. In the eyes of a people who, like the Hebrews, identified the principle of life with the breath,[2] the mere act of smelling a perfume might easily assume a spiritual aspect; the scented breath inhaled might seem an accession of life, an addition made to the essence of the soul. Hence it would be natural to regard the fragrant object itself, whether a scent-bottle, incense, or a flower, as a centre of radiant spiritual energy, and therefore as a fitting place into which to breathe out the soul whenever it was deemed desirable to do so for a time. Far-fetched as this idea may appear to us, it may seem natural enough to the folk and to their best interpreters the poets:—

"*I sent thee late a rosy wreath,*
Not so much honouring thee
As giving it a hope that there
It could not wither'd be;
But thou thereon didst only breathe
And sent'st it back to me;
Since when it grows, and smells, I swear,
Not of itself but thee!"[3]

---

which, at the same time, serve as amulets. See Ph. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas, Die materielle Cultur der Danâkil, Galla, und Somâl* (Berlin, 1893), pp. 95 *sq.* Compare F. Stuhlmann, *Mit Emin Pascha ins Hertz von Afrika* (Berlin, 1894), p. 518. On the relation of jewellery to magic, see Professor W. Ridgeway, in *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Meeting held at Southport, 1903*, pp. 815 *sq.*

[1] Fr. Brown, S. R. Driver, and Ch. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1906), p. 538. Similarly Kautsch in his German translation, and Dillmann and Skinner in their commentaries on Isaiah. In another passage (xxvi. 16) Isaiah uses the same word (לַחַשׁ) in the phrase "compulsion of a spell," where we must read צְקוֹן for צָקוּן with many critics. See Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op. cit.* pp. 538, 848.

[2] Genesis ii. 7. Compare C. Gruneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels* (Halle, a. S., 1900), pp. 23 *sqq.*; B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, i. (Tübingen, 1905) pp. 181 *sq.*; A. Lods, *La Croyance à la Vie Future et le Culte des Morts dans l'Antiquité Israélite* (Paris, 1906), i. 51 *sqq.* The last of these writers appears, however, to be right in holding that the Hebrews had no single consistent theory as to the nature of the soul.

[3] "Jonson's learned sock" was on when he wrote these beautiful verses. See Philostratus, *Epist.* 2, Πέπομφά σοι στέφανον ῥόδων, οὐ σὲ τιμῶν, καὶ τοῦτο

Or again:

"*Ihr verblühet, süsse Rosen,*
Meine Liebe trug euch nicht."

Folk-lore and poetry.

But if beauty can thus be thought to give of her life, her soul, to the soul of the rose to keep it fadeless, it is not extravagant to suppose that she can breathe her soul also into her scent-bottle. At all events these old-world fancies, if such indeed they are, would explain very naturally why a scent-bottle should be called a "house of the soul." But the folk-lore of scents has yet to be studied. In investigating it, as every other branch of folk-lore, the student may learn much from the poets, who perceive by intuition what most of us have to learn by a laborious collection of facts. Indeed, without some touch of poetic fancy, it is hardly possible to enter into the heart of the people. A frigid rationalist will knock in vain at the magic rose-wreathed portal of fairyland. The porter will not open to Mr. Gradgrind.

μὲν γάρ, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς τι χαριζόμενος τοῖς ῥόδοις, ἵνα μὴ μαρανθῇ. And again, *Epist.* 46, *Εὖ πεποίηκας στρωμνῇ χρησάμενος τοῖς ῥόδοις . . . εἰ δὲ βούλει τι φίλῳ χαρίζεσθαι, τὰ λείψανα αὐτῶν ἀντίπεμψον μηκέτι πνέοντα ῥόδων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοῦ.* And the thought of the first stanza of the same song,

"*Drink to me only with thine eyes,*
And I will pledge with mine;
Or leave a kiss but in the cup
And I'll not look for wine,"

is also borrowed from the same elegant writer. See Philostratus, *Epist.* 33, *Ἐμοὶ δὲ μόνοις πρόπινε τοῖς ὄμμασιν . . . εἰ δὲ βούλει, τὸν μὲν οἶνον μὴ παραπόλλυε, μόνου δ' ἐμβαλοῦσα ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς χείλεσι προσφέρουσα πλήρου φιλημάτων τὸ ἔκπωμα καὶ οὕτως δίδου τοῖς δεομένοις.* Elsewhere Philostratus whose fancy, like that of Herrick, seems to have run much on love and roses, plays on the same thoughts (*Epist.* 60 and 63). Another passage in his letters (*Epist.* 55, *μαραίνεται καὶ γυνὴ μετὰ ῥόδων, ἂν βραδύνῃ. Μὴ μέλλε, ὦ καλή· συμπαίξωμεν, στεφανωσώμεθα τοῖς ῥόδοις, ξυνδράμωμεν*) might have served as a text for Herrick's

"*Gather ye rose-buds while ye may.*"

But without doubt the English poet drew his inspiration from living roses in English gardens and English hedges, not from dead Greek roses in the dusty pages of Philostratus.

CHAPTER VIII

THE WITCH OF ENDOR

ONE of the most tragic figures in the history of Israel is that of Saul, the first king of the nation. Dissatisfied with the rule of pontiffs who professed to govern them in the name and under the direct guidance of the deity, the people had clamoured for a civil king, and the last of the pontiffs, the prophet Samuel, had reluctantly yielded to their importunity and anointed Saul king of Israel. The revolution thus effected was such as might have taken place in the Papal States, if ever the inhabitants, weary of ecclesiastical oppression and misgovernment, had risen against the Popes, and compelled the reigning pontiff, while he still clutched the heavenly keys, to resign the earthly sceptre into the hands of a secular monarch. A shrewd man of affairs as well as an ecclesiastic of the most rigid type, Samuel had dexterously contrived not only to anoint but to nominate the new king on whom the hopes of Israel now centred.

Saul and Samuel.

The man of his choice was well fitted to win the admiration and attract the homage of the crowd. His tall and stately form, his gallant bearing, his skilful generalship and dauntless courage on the field of battle, all marked him out as a natural leader of men. Yet, under a showy exterior, this dashing and popular soldier concealed some fatal infirmities,—a jealous and suspicious disposition, a choleric temper, a weakness of will, a vacillation of purpose, and, above all, a brooding melancholy under which his intellect, never of a high order, sometimes trembled on the verge of insanity. In such dark hours the profound dejection which clouded his brain could only be lightened and dispelled by the soothing strains of

The character of Saul.

solemn music; and one of the most graphic pictures painted for us by the Hebrew historian is that of the handsome king sitting sunk in gloom, while the minstrel boy, the ruddy-cheeked David, stood before him discoursing sweet music on the trembling strings of the harp, till the frown passed from the royal brow and the sufferer found a truce to his uneasy thoughts.

Saul the tool of Samuel.

Perhaps with his keen eye Samuel had detected and even counted on these weaknesses when, bowing to the popular will, he ostensibly consented to be superseded in the supreme direction of affairs. He may have reckoned on setting up Saul as an ornamental figure-head, a florid mask, which, under the martial features of the brave but pliable soldier, should conceal the stern visage of the inflexible prophet; he may have expected to treat the king as a crowned and sceptred puppet, who would dance on the national stage to the tune played by his ghostly adviser behind the scenes. If such were his calculations when he raised Saul to the throne, they were fully justified by the event. For so long as Samuel lived, Saul was little more than a tool in hands far stronger than his own. The prophet was indeed one of those masterful natures, those fanatics cast in an iron mould, who, mistaking their own unbending purpose for the will of heaven, march forward unswervingly to their goal, trampling down all opposition, their hearts steeled against every tender emotion of humanity and pity. While Saul was content to do the bidding of this imperious mentor, committing his conscience to him as to a father confessor, he was graciously permitted to strut before the eyes of the vulgar wearing his shadowy crown; but no sooner did he dare to diverge by a hair's breadth from the ruthless commands laid on him by his spiritual director, than Samuel broke his puppet king and threw him away as an instrument that had ceased to serve his purpose. The prophet secretly appointed a successor to Saul in the person of the minstrel David, and indignantly turning his back on the now repentant and conscience-stricken king, he refused to see him again and continued to mourn over him as dead till the end of his life.[1]

The breach between Saul and Samuel.

After that, things went ill with Saul. Deprived of the

[1] 1 Samuel xv., compare xiii. 8-14.

strong arm on which he had long trustfully leaned, he followed a course ever more wayward and erratic. His melancholy deepened. His suspicions multiplied. His temper, always uncertain, became uncontrollable. He gave way to outbursts of fury. He attempted the life, not only of David, but of his own son Jonathan, and though these fits of passionate anger were sometimes followed by fits of as passionate remorse, the steady deterioration of his once noble nature was unmistakeable. Moral deterioration of Saul.

While the clouds thus gathered thick about his setting sun, it happened that the Philistines, against whom he had waged a lifelong war, invaded the land in greater force than ever. Saul mustered the militia of Israel to oppose them, and the two armies encamped on opposite hill-slopes with the broad valley of Jezreel lying between them. It was the eve of battle. The morrow would decide the fate of Israel. The king looked forward to the decisive struggle with deep misgiving. A weight like lead hung on his drooping spirits. He deemed himself forsaken of God, for all his attempts to lift the veil and pry into the future by means of the legitimate forms of divination had proved fruitless. The prophets were silent: the oracles were dumb: no vision of the night brightened with a ray of hope his heavy and dreamless sleep. Even music, which once could charm away his cares, was no longer at his command. His own violence had banished the deft musician, whose cunning hand had so often swept the strings and wakened all their harmonies to lap his troubled soul in momentary forgetfulness of sorrow. In his despair the king's mind reverted irresistibly to Samuel, the faithful counsellor to whom in happier days he had never looked in vain for help. But Samuel was in his grave at Ramah. Yet a thought struck the king. Might he not summon up the dead seer from the grave and elicit words of hope and comfort from his ghostly lips? The thing was possible, but difficult; for he had himself driven into exile all the practitioners of the black art. He inquired of his servants, and learned from them that a witch still lived at the village of Endor, not many miles away to the north, among the hills on the farther side of the valley. The king resolved to consult her and, if possible, to set his harassing doubts and fears

The eve of battle.

Saul's disquiet.

He resolves to consult the ghost of Samuel.

at rest. It was a hazardous enterprise, for between him and the witch's home lay the whole army of the Philistines. To go by day would have been to court death. It was necessary to wait for nightfall.

Saul sets out for Endor.

Having made all his dispositions for battle, the king retired to his tent, but not to sleep. The fever in his blood forbade repose, and he impatiently expected the hour when he could set out under cover of darkness. At last the sun went down, the shadows deepened, and the tumult of the camp subsided into silence. The king now laid aside the regal pomp in which he had but lately shown himself to the army, and muffling his tall figure in a common robe he lifted the flap of the tent and, followed by two attendants, stole out into the night. Around him in the starlight lay the slumbering forms of his soldiers, stretched in groups on the bare ground about their piled arms, the dying embers of the fires casting here and there a fitful gleam on the sleepers. On the opposite hillside, far as the eye could see, twinkled the watch-fires of the enemy, and the distant sounds of revelry and music, borne across the valley on the night wind, told of the triumph which the insolent foe anticipated on the morrow.

Saul and the witch of Endor.

Striking straight across the plain the three adventurers came to the foot of the hills, and giving a wide berth to the last outpost of the Philistine camp, they began the ascent. A desolate track led them over the shoulder of the hill to the miserable village of Endor, its mud-built hovels stuck to the side of the rocks on the bare stony declivity. Away to the north Mount Tabor loomed up black and massive against the sky, and in the farthest distance the snowy top of Hermon showed pale and ghost-like in the starlight. But the travellers had neither leisure nor inclination to survey the nocturnal landscape. The king's guide led the way to a cottage; a light was burning in the window, and he tapped softly at the door. It seemed that the party was expected, for a woman's voice from within bade them enter. They did so, and closing the door behind them, they stood in the presence of the witch. The sacred writer has not described her appearance, so we are free to picture her according to our fancy. She may have been young and fair, with raven

locks and lustrous eyes, or she may have been a wizened, toothless hag, with meeting nose and chin, blear eyes and grizzled hair, bent double with age and infirmity. We cannot tell, and the king was doubtless too preoccupied to pay much attention to her aspect. He bluntly told her the object of his visit. "Divine unto me," he said, "I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me up whomsoever I shall name unto thee." But the beldame protested, and reminded her visitor, in whom she did not recognize the king, of the royal proclamation against witches and warlocks, asserting that it was as much as her life was worth to comply with the request. Only when the tall stranger, with an air between entreaty and command, assured her on his honour that no harm should befall her, did she at last consent to exert her uncanny powers on his behalf. She asked, "Whom shall I bring up unto thee?" And he said, "Bring me up Samuel." The demand startled the necromancer, and looking hard at her visitor she discerned him to be the king. In great alarm, believing she had been caught in a trap, she cried out, "Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul." But the king pacified her with an assurance of his royal clemency and bade her proceed with her incantations. She settled herself to her task accordingly, and gazing intently into what seemed to her visitors mere vacancy, it was soon manifest by her wild and haggard look that she saw something invisible to them. The king asked her what she saw. "I see," said she, "a god coming up out of the earth." Saul asked, "What form is he of?" And she answered, "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a robe." So the king perceived that it was the ghost of Samuel, and he bowed with his face to the ground, and did obeisance. But the ghost asked sternly, "Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" The king replied, "I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams: therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." But the unhappy monarch found the ghost as hard and implacable as the living prophet had been when he turned his back in anger on the king who had presumed to disobey his behest. In pitiless tones the inexorable old

The ghost of Samuel announces the approaching defeat of Saul.

man demanded of the trembling suppliant how he dared, he the forsaken of God, to consult him, the prophet of God? He upbraided him once more with his disobedience: he reminded him of his prophecy that the kingdom should be rent from him and given to David: he announced the fulfilment of the prediction; and he wound up his fierce invective by declaring that to-morrow should witness the defeat of Israel by the Philistines, and that before another sun had set Saul and his sons should be with him in the nether world. With these dreadful words the grim spectre sank into the earth, and Saul fell to the ground in a faint.[1]

Necromancy among the ancient Hebrews.

From this graphic narrative we learn that the practice of necromancy, or the evocation of the spirits of the dead for the purpose of consulting them oracularly, was familiar in ancient Israel, and that severe legislative prohibitions were unable wholly to suppress it. How deeply rooted the custom was in the popular religion or superstition of the people we can see from the behaviour of Saul, who in his dire distress did not hesitate to call in the services of the very same necromancers whom in the days of his prosperity he had laid under a ban. His example is typical of that tendency to relapse into heathenism which the prophets of Israel observed

[1] 1 Samuel xxviii. 3-20. In verse 12 it seems that we must read "And when the woman saw Saul" with six manuscripts of the Septuagint and some modern critics, instead of "And when the woman saw Samuel." See S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, Second Edition (Oxford, 1913), p. 215; A. R. S. Kennedy, *Samuel* (Edinburgh and London, 1905), pp. 178 *sq.* (*The Century Bible*). The change is approved by R. Kittel in his edition of the Hebrew text (*Biblia Hebraica*, Leipsic, 1905–1906, i. 411). As to the topography of the battlefield and of Endor, see A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, Second Edition (London, 1856), pp. 331 *sqq.*; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book* (London, 1859), pp. 445 *sqq.*; H. B. Tristram, *The Land of Israel*, Fourth Edition (London, 1882), pp. 123 *sqq.*; C. R. Conder, *Tent Work in Palestine*, New Edition (London, 1885), pp. 62 *sqq.*; (Sir) G. A. Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (London, 1894), pp. 379 *sqq.* I have ventured to transfer to antiquity the modern descriptions of Endor. Compare in particular H. B. Tristram, *op. cit.* pp. 124 *sq.*: "It might be fancy, but the place has a strange, weird-like aspect—a miserable village on the north side of the hill, without a tree or a shrub to relieve the squalor of its decaying heaps. It is full of caves, and the mud-built hovels are stuck on to the sides of the rocks in clusters, and are, for the most part, a mere continuation and enlargement of the cavern behind, which forms the larger portion of this human den. The inhabitants were the most filthy and ragged we had seen, and as the old crones, startled at the rare apparition of strangers strolling near their holes, came forth and cursed us, a Holman Hunt might have immortalised on canvas the very features of the necromancer of Israel."

and deplored in their countrymen, and which always manifested itself most prominently in seasons of extraordinary calamity or danger when the ordinances of the orthodox religion appeared to be unavailing. A law of Israel, which in its existing form is probably much later than the time of Saul but may nevertheless embody a very ancient usage, denounced the penalty of death by stoning against all who had familiar spirits or were wizards, that is, apparently, against all who professed to evoke the souls of the dead for the sake of consulting them oracularly.[1] Yet among the pagan practices revived long after the days of Saul by King Manasseh was that of necromancy; from the holes and corners into which the practitioners of that black art had been driven by the terror of the law, the superstitious monarch brought them forth and established them publicly in the light of day.[2] However, in his sweeping reformation of the national religion the pious King Josiah soon afterwards relegated all necromancers, witches, and wizards to the criminal classes, from which they had for a short period emerged.[3]

The voice of the ghost.

The account of the interview of Saul with the ghost of Samuel clearly implies that the phantom was visible only to the witch, but that the king, though he did not see it, was able to hear its voice and to answer it directly. We may safely conclude that this was one of the regular ways in which Israelitish witches and wizards professed to hold converse with the dead; they pretended to conjure up and to see the ghost, while their dupes saw nothing but heard

[1] Leviticus xx. 27, compare xix. 31, xx. 6. The words which in these verses are translated "familiar spirit" (אוֹב) and "wizard" (יִדְּעֹנִי) are the same with those similarly translated in Samuel xxviii. 3, 7, 8, 9, where the reference is clearly to necromancers. This prohibition of necromancy in Leviticus forms part of what the critics call the Holiness Code, a body of law which probably included the ancient usages of the local sanctuaries before the great Deuteronomic reformation of King Josiah in 621 B.C., though the compilation of the code probably fell somewhat later, near the end of the Jewish monarchy. See S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, Ninth Edition (Edinburgh, 1913), pp. 47 *sqq.*, 145 *sqq.*; A. R. S. Kennedy, *Leviticus and Numbers*, pp. 25-28 (*The Century Bible*).

[2] 2 Kings xxi. 6. The verb (עָשָׂה) should be translated "appointed," the marginal rendering of the English Revised Version, rather than "dealt with." The words for necromancers in this passage are the same as in Leviticus xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, and in Samuel xxviii. 3, 7, 8, 9.

[3] Deuteronomy xviii. 10-12. That the book of Deuteronomy embodies the legislation of Josiah is now generally recognized by the critics.

a voice speaking, which, in their simplicity, they took to be that of the spirit, though in reality it would commonly be the voice either of the wizard himself or of a confederate. In such cases, whatever the source of the sound, it appeared to proceed not from the mouth of the wizard, but from a point outside him, which the credulous inquirer supposed to be the station of the invisible ghost. Such audible effects could easily be produced by ventriloquism, which has the advantage of enabling the necromancer to work without the assistance of a confederate, and so to lessen the chance of detection.

The place from which the voice of the ghost appeared to proceed.

The witch told Saul that the ghost of Samuel rose out of the earth, and through the exertion of her vocal talent she may have caused to issue apparently from the ground a hollow and squeaky voice which the king mistook for the accents of the deceased seer; for in such hollow, squeaky tones were ghosts commonly supposed to discourse from the ground.[1] However, the necromancer did not always take the trouble of projecting his voice out of himself; he was often content to bring it up from his own inside and to palm it off on his gullible hearers as the voice of his familiar spirit or of the worshipful ghost. Hence the familiar spirit or the ghost was said to be inside the necromancer:[2] the supernatural accents appeared to issue from his stomach.[3] But wherever the voice may have seemed to come from, whether from the bowels of the earth or from the bowels of the conjuror, it is probable that the ghost himself always modestly kept in the background; for we can hardly suppose that in the rudimentary state of Hebrew art Hebrew wizards were able, like their brethren of a later age, to astonish and terrify

[1] Isaiah xxix. 4.

[2] Leviticus xx. 27, וְאִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה כִּי יִהְיֶה בָהֶם אוֹב אוֹ יִדְּעֹנִי "a man also or a woman in whom is a ghost or a familiar spirit." However, the phrase might be otherwise rendered, "a man or a woman, if there should be among them a necromancer or wizard," as the words are translated in the Oxford *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, *s.v.* אוֹב, p. 15.

[3] Isaiah viii. 19 (Septuagint), *τοὺς ἐγγαστριμύθους καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φωνοῦντας τοὺς κενολογοῦντας οἱ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας φωνοῦσιν.* On the various Hebrew modes of consulting the dead, compare W. Robertson Smith, "On the forms of Divination and Magic enumerated in Deut. xviii. 10, 11," *Journal of Philology*, xiv. (1885) pp. 127 *sq.*; S. R. Driver, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, Third Edition (Edinburgh, 1902), pp. 225 *sqq.*; C. Grüneisen, *Der Ahnenkultus und die Urreligion Israels* (Halle, a.S., 1900), pp. 148 *sqq.*; A. Lods, *La Croyance à la Vie Future et le Culte des Morts dans l'Antiquité Israélite* (Paris, 1906), pp. 242 *sqq.*

believers by exhibiting to them in a dark room the figures of hobgoblins, which, painted in inflammable pigments on the walls, and ignited at the proper moment by the application of a torch, suddenly burst out from the gloom in lurid splendour to confirm the mysteries of faith by the demonstrations of science.[1]

Necromancy in the Gilgamesh epic: the ghost of Eabani evoked.

The practice of necromancy was probably common to the Hebrews with other branches of the Semitic race. A clear reference to it appears to be contained in the twelfth canto of the Gilgamesh epic. There the hero Gilgamesh is represented mourning for his dead friend Eabani. In his sorrow he appeals to the gods to bring up for him the soul of his departed comrade from the nether world. But one after another the deities confess themselves powerless to grant his request. At last he prays to Nergal, the god of the dead, saying, "Break open the chamber of the grave *and open the ground*, that the spirit of Eabani, like a wind, may rise out of the ground." The deity graciously listened to his prayer. "He broke open the chamber of the grave and opened the ground; and caused the spirit of Eabani to rise out of the ground like a wind." With the ghost thus summoned from the vasty deep Gilgamesh converses, and learns from him the mournful state of the dead in the nether world, where is the devouring worm and all things are cloaked in dust. However, the gloominess of the picture is a little relieved by the information which the apparition vouchsafes as to the solace which the rites of burial afford to the souls of warriors fallen in battle, compared with the deplorable condition of those whose corpses have been suffered to welter unburied on the field.[2]

Necromancy among the ancient Greeks.

The ancient Greeks were familiar with the practice of evoking the souls of the dead in order either to obtain information from them or to appease their wrath. The first instance of necromancy in Greek literature occurs in the

[1] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium Haeresium*, iv. 35, p. 102, ed. L. Duncker and F. G. Schneidewin (Göttingen, 1859).

[2] L. W. King, *Babylonian Religion and Mythology* (London, 1899), pp. 174-176; R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature* (New York, 1901), pp. 363-367. Compare P. Jensen, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen* (Berlin, 1900), pp. 257 *sqq.*; P. Dhorme, *Choix de Textes Religieux Assyro-Babyloniens* (Paris, 1907), pp. 317 *sqq.*; A. Ungnad und H. Gressmann, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* (Göttingen, 1911), pp. 64 *sqq.*

The evocation of the ghosts by Ulysses.

famous passage of the *Odyssey*, where Ulysses sails to the gloomy land on the utmost verge of Ocean, and there summons up the ghosts from the underworld. In order that he may get speech of them, he has to dig a trench and sacrifice sheep over it, allowing their blood to drain into its depth. Thereupon the weak and thirsty ghosts gather at the trench, and, after quaffing the blood, say their sooth to the hero, who sits beside it, drawn sword in hand, keeping order among the shades and suffering none to gulp the precious liquid out of his turn. The first whom he allows to approach and drink is the ghost of the Theban soothsayer Tiresias, whom Ulysses desired to consult as to his return home after all his long wanderings on the sea. Only when the seer has satisfied his curiosity on that point does the war-worn and way-weary soldier enter into conversation with the souls of other famous men and fair ladies in the sunless land.[1] However, this interview with the ghosts in what may be called their home country is somewhat different from necromancy in the ordinary sense, or the evocation of the dead in the land of the living.

Ancient Greek oracles of the dead.

In ancient Greece it would seem that the practice of calling up the shades from the nether regions was not carried on by necromancers at any place indiscriminately, but was restricted to certain definite spots which were supposed to communicate directly with the underworld by passages or apertures, through which the spirits could come up and go down as they were summoned or dismissed. Such spots were called oracles of the dead,[2] and at them alone, so far as appears, could legitimate business with the shades of the departed be transacted.

Oracle of the dead at Aornum in Thesprotis consulted by Periander, tyrant of Corinth.

Of these oracles of the dead there was one at Aornum in Thesprotis, where the legendary musician Orpheus is said to have called up, but called in vain, the soul of his loved and lost Eurydice.[3] In a later age the tyrant Periander of Corinth sent to the same oracle to consult the ghost of his dead wife Melissa about a deposit which a stranger had left in his charge, and which had been mislaid. But the ghost refused to answer his question, declaring that she was cold and naked, because the clothes which he had

[1] Homer, *Odyssey*, x. 487 *sqq.*, xi.

[2] Νεκυομαντεῖα, less commonly νεκρομαντεῖα, ψυχομαντεῖα.

[3] Pausanias ix. 30. 6.

buried with her body were of no use to her, not having been burnt. On receiving this answer Periander issued a proclamation that all the women of Corinth should assemble in the sanctuary of Hera. They did so accordingly in all their finery as for a festival; but no sooner were they gathered than the tyrant surrounded the gay assembly with his guards, and caused every woman in it, mistress and maid alike, to be stripped of her clothes, which he thereupon piled up in a pit and burned for the benefit of his deceased spouse. Transmitted by the medium of fire, the garments reached their address; for when Periander afterwards sent again to the oracle and repeated his question about the deposit, his wife's ghost, now warm and comfortable, answered readily.[1]

The seat of the oracle.

The whole vicinity of this oracular seat would seem to have been associated with, if not haunted by, the spirits of the dead; for the names of the infernal rivers were given to the neighbouring waters. Beside it ran the Acheron,[2] and not far off flowed the Cocytus,[3] "named of lamentation loud heard on the rueful stream." The exact spot where this commerce with the other world was maintained is perhaps to be identified with a hamlet now called Glyky, where some fragments of granite columns and pieces of a white marble cornice may mark the site of an ancient temple.

The scenery of the country.

The river Acheron, now called the Suliotiko or Phanariotiko river, here issues from the wild and barren mountains of the once famous Suli, to wander, a sluggish, turbid, weedy stream, through a wide stretch of swampy plain till it falls into the sea. Before entering the plain from the mountains, which stand up behind it like a huge grey wall, the river traverses a profound and gloomy gorge, one of the darkest and deepest of the glens of Greece. On either side precipices rise sheer from the water's edge to a height of hundreds of feet, their ledges and crannies tufted with dwarf oaks and shrubs. Higher up, where the sides of the glen recede from the perpendicular, the mountains soar to a height of over three thousand feet, the black pine-woods which cling to their precipitous sides adding to the sombre magnificence of the scene. A perilous footpath leads along a narrow ledge high

[1] Herodotus v. 92. 7.

[2] Herodotus v. 92. 7.

[3] Pausanias i. 17. 5.

up on the mountain side, from which the traveller gazes down into the depths of the tremendous ravine, where the rapid river may be seen rushing and foaming along, often plunging in a cascade into a dark abyss, but so far below him that even the roar of the waterfall is lost in mid-air before it can reach his ear.[1] The whole landscape combines the elements of grandeur, solitude, and desolation in a degree that is fitted to oppress the mind with a sense of awe and gloom, and thereby to predispose it for communion with supernatural beings. No wonder that in these rugged mountains, these dreary fens, these melancholy streams, the ancients fancied they beheld the haunts of the spirits of the dead.

Oracle of the dead at Heraclea in Bithynia.

Another oracle of the dead was established at Heraclea in Bithynia. The Spartan King Pausanias, who defeated the Persians in the battle of Plataea, resorted to this oracle, and there attempted to summon up and propitiate the ghost of a Byzantine maiden name Cleonice, whom he had accidentally killed. Her spirit appeared to him and announced in ambiguous language that all his troubles would cease when he should return to Sparta. The prophecy was fulfilled by the king's speedy death.[2]

Oracles imparted by the dead in dreams.

We have no information as to the mode in which the ghosts were supposed to appear and reply to questions at these places; hence we cannot say whether the phantoms revealed themselves to the inquirer himself or only to the wizard who conjured them up; nor again do we know whether the person who was favoured with these manifestations beheld them awake or in dreams. However, at some Greek oracles of the dead the communication with the souls of the departed is known to have taken place in sleep. Such,

The oracle of Mopsus in Cilicia.

for example, was the custom at the oracle of the soothsayer Mopsus in Cilicia. Plutarch tells us that on one occasion the governor of Cilicia, a sceptic in religion and a friend of Epicurean philosophers, who derided the supernatural, resolved to test the oracle. For that purpose he wrote a question on

[1] W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece* (London, 1835), i. 231-242, iv. 50-66; Christopher Wordsworth, *Greece*, New Edition (London, 1882), pp. 332-339; C. Bursian, *Geographie von Griechenland* (Leipsic, 1862-1872), i. 27-29; *Guides-Joanne, Grèce*, ii. (Paris, 1891) pp. 105 *sqq.*

[2] Plutarch, *Cimon*, 6; *id.*, *De sera numinis vindicta*, 10. Compare Pausanias iii. 17. 8 *sq.*

a tablet, and without revealing what he had written to anybody he sealed up the tablet and entrusted it to a freedman, with orders to submit the question to the ghostly seer. Accordingly the man slept that night, according to custom, in the shrine of Mopsus, and next morning he reported to the governor that he had dreamed a dream. He thought he saw a handsome man standing by him, who opened his mouth, and, having uttered the single word "Black," immediately vanished. The friends of the governor, who had assembled to hear and to quiz the messenger from the other world, were at a loss what to make of this laconic message, but no sooner did the governor himself receive it than he fell on his knees in an attitude of devotion. The reason for this very unusual posture was revealed when the seal of the tablet was broken and its contents read aloud. For the question which the governor had written therein was this, "Shall I sacrifice a white bull or a black?" The appropriateness of the answer staggered even the incredulous Epicurean philosophers, and as for the governor himself, he sacrificed the black bull and continued to revere the dead soothsayer Mopsus to the end of his days.[1]

Dream oracle of the dead in Italy.

The pious Plutarch, who reports with obvious satisfaction this triumphant refutation of shallow infidelity, has related another incident of the same sort which was said to have occurred in Italy. A certain very rich man named Elysius, a native of the Greek city of Terina in Bruttium, lost his son and heir, Euthynus, by a sudden and mysterious death. Fearing that there might have been foul play in this loss of the heir to all his riches, the anxious father had recourse to an oracle of the dead. There he offered a sacrifice, and then, in accordance with the custom of the sanctuary, he fell asleep and dreamed a dream. It seemed to him that he saw his own father, and begged and prayed him to help in tracking down the author of his son's death. "For that very purpose am I come," answered the ghost, "and I beg you will accept my message from this young man," pointing, as he said so, to a youth who followed at his heels, and who resembled to the life the son whose loss Elysius mourned. Startled by the likeness, Elysius asked the young man, "And who are you?" to which the

[1] Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*, 45.

phantom answered, "I am your son's genius. Take that." So saying, he handed to Elysius a tablet inscribed with some verses, which declared that his son had died a natural death, because death was better for him than life.[1]

Dream oracles on graves in North Africa in ancient and modern times.

In antiquity the Nasamones, a tribe of northern Libya, used to seek for oracular dreams by sleeping on the tombs of their ancestors;[2] probably they imagined that the souls of the departed rose from their graves to advise and comfort their descendants. A similar custom is still practised by some of the Tuaregs of the Sahara. When the men are away on distant expeditions, their wives, dressed in their finest clothes, will go and lie on ancient tombs, where they call up the soul of one who will give them news of their husbands. At their call a spirit named Idebni appears in the form of a man. If the woman contrives to please this spirit, he tells her all that has happened on the expedition; but if she fails to win his favour, he strangles her.[3] Similarly, "near the Wady Augidit, in the Northern Sahara, is a group of great elliptical tombs. The Azgar woman, when desiring news of an absent husband, brother, or lover, goes to these graves and sleeps among them. She is thought to be sure to receive visions which will give her the news she seeks."[4] So, too, the Toradjas of Central Celebes will sometimes go and sleep upon a grave in order to receive advice from the ghost in a dream.[5]

Dream oracles on graves in Celebes.

Aeschylus's description of the evocation of the ghost of King Darius.

The most elaborate description of the evocation of a ghost in Greek literature is to be found in Aeschylus's tragedy, *The Persians*. The scene of the play is laid at the tomb of King Darius, where Queen Atossa, the wife of Xerxes, is anxiously waiting for news of her husband and the mighty host which he had led against Greece. A messenger arrives with tidings of the total defeat of the Persians at Salamis. In her grief and consternation the queen resolves to summon up the ghost of Darius from the grave, and to seek counsel of him in the great emergency. For that

[1] Plutarch, *Consolatio ad Apollonium*, 14.

[2] Herodotus iv. 172. Compare Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia*, i. 46.

[3] Henri Duveyrier, *Exploration du Sahara: les Touareg du Nord* (Paris, 1864), p. 415.

[4] Oric Bates, *The Eastern Libyans* (London, 1914), pp. 178 *sq.*, referring to E. von Bary, *Ghât et les Touareg de l'Air*, p. 63.

[5] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912-1914), i. 253.

purpose she offers libations of milk, honey, water, wine, and olive oil at the tomb, while at the same time the chorus chants hymns calling on the gods of the nether world to send up the soul of the dead king to the light of day. The ghost accordingly emerges from the earth, and learning of the disaster that has befallen the Persian arms, he gives advice and warning to his afflicted people.[1] In this account it is clearly implied that the ghost appears in broad daylight, and not merely in a dream, to those who have evoked it; but whether the poet is describing a Greek or a Persian form of necromancy, or is simply drawing on his own imagination, we cannot say for certain. Probably the description is based on rites commonly performed by Greek necromancers, either at the regular oracles of the dead, or at the graves of the particular persons whose ghosts they desired to consult. The Pythagorean philosopher Apollonius of Tyana is reported by his biographer Philostratus to have conjured up the soul of Achilles from his grave in Thessaly. The hero appeared from the barrow in the likeness of a tall and handsome young man, and entered into conversation with the sage in the most affable manner, complaining that the Thessalians had long since ceased to bring offerings to his tomb, and begging him to remonstrate with them on their negligence.[2] In Pliny's youth a certain grammarian named Apion professed to have evoked the shade of Homer and questioned the poet as to his parents and his native land, but he refused to reveal the answers which he received from the ghost; hence later ages have not benefited by this bold attempt to solve the Homeric problem at the fountain head.[3]

Evocation of the souls of Achilles and Homer.

The poet Lucan has given us, in his usual tawdry bombastic style, a tedious report of an interview which, according to the bard, Sextus Pompeius, son of Pompey the Great, had with a Thessalian witch before the battle of Pharsalia. Anxious to learn the issue of the war, the unworthy son of a great father, as Lucan calls him, has recourse, not to the legitimate oracles of the gods, but to the vile arts of witchcraft and necromancy. At his request a foul hag, whose dwelling is among the tombs, restores an unburied corpse to life, and

Lucan's description of the evocation of the dead by a Thessalian witch.

[1] Aeschylus, *Persians*, 600-838. [2] Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon.* iv. 16.
[3] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxx. 18.

the soul thus temporarily replaced in its earthly tabernacle tells of the commotion which it has witnessed among the shades at the prospect of the catastrophe so soon to befall the Roman world. Having delivered his message, the dead man requests as a particular favour to be allowed to die a second time for good and all. The witch grants his request, and considerately erects a pyre for his convenience, to which the corpse walks unassisted and is there comfortably burnt to ashes.[1] Thessalian witches were certainly notorious in antiquity, and it is likely enough that necromancy was one of the black arts which they professed; but no reliance can be placed on Lucan's highly coloured description of the rites which they observed in evoking the ghosts. More probable is the account which Horace gives of the proceedings of two witches, whom he represents as pouring the blood of a black lamb into a trench for the purpose of calling up ghosts to answer questions.[2] Tibullus speaks of a witch who conjured up the shades from their tombs by her chants;[3] and in the reign of Tiberius a high-born but feeble-minded youth, named Libo, who dabbled in the black arts, requested a certain Junius to evoke the spirits of the dead for him by incantations.[4]

Horace and Tibullus on the evocation of the dead.

More than one of the wicked Roman emperors are said to have had recourse to necromancy in the hope of allaying those terrors with which the memory of their crimes, like avenging spirits, visited their uneasy consciences. We are told that the monster Nero never knew peace of mind again after he had murdered his mother Agrippina: he often confessed that he was haunted by her spectre and by the Furies with whips and burning torches, and it was in vain that by magic rites he conjured up her ghost and attempted to appease her anger.[5] Similarly, the crazed and bloody tyrant Caracalla imagined that the phantoms of his father Severus and of his murdered brother Geta pursued him with drawn swords, and to obtain some alleviation of these horrors he called in the help of wizards. Among the ghosts which they evoked for him were those of the emperor's father and

Evocation of the dead by the Emperors Nero and Caracalla.

[1] Lucan, *Pharsalia*, vi. 413-830.
[2] Horace, *Sat.* i. 26-29.
[3] Tibullus i. 2. 47 *sq.*
[4] Tacitus, *Annals*, ii. 27 *sq.*
[5] Suetonius, *Nero*, xxxiv. 4.

the Emperor Commodus. But of all the shades thus summoned to his aid none deigned to hold converse with the imperial assassin except the kindred spirit of Commodus, and even from him no words of consolation or hope could be elicited, nothing but dark hints of a fearful judgment to come, which only served to fill the guilty soul of Caracalla with a fresh access of terror.[1]

Necromancy in Africa. Oracles of dead kings among the Baganda.

The art of necromancy has been practised by barbarous as well as civilized peoples. In some African tribes the practice has prevailed of consulting the ghosts of dead kings or chiefs as oracles through the medium of a priest or priestess, who professed to be inspired by the soul of a deceased ruler and to speak in his name. For example, among the Baganda of Central Africa a temple was built for the ghost of each dead king, and in it his lower jawbone was reverently preserved; for curiously enough the part of his body to which the ghost of a dead Baganda man clings most persistently is his jawbone. The temple, a large conical hut of the usual pattern, was divided into two chambers, an outer and an inner, and in the inner chamber or holy of holies the precious jawbone was kept for safety in a cell dug in the floor. The prophet or medium, whose business it was from time to time to be inspired by the ghost of the dead monarch, dedicated himself to his holy office by drinking a draught of beer and a draught of milk out of the royal skull. When the ghost held a reception, the jawbone, wrapt in a decorated packet, was brought forth from the inner shrine and set on a throne in the outer chamber, where the people assembled to hear the oracle. On such occasions the prophet stepped up to the throne, and addressing the spirit informed him of the business in hand. Then he smoked one or two pipes of homegrown tobacco, and the fumes bringing on the prophetic fit he began to rave and speak in the very voice and with the characteristic turns of speech of the departed monarch; for the king's soul was now supposed to be in him. However, his rapid utterances were hard to understand, and a priest was in attendance to interpret them to the inquirer. The living king thus consulted his dead predecessors periodically on affairs of state, visiting first one

[1] Dio Cassius lxxvii. 15.

and then another of the temples in which their sacred relics were preserved with religious care.[1]

Oracles of dead kings among the Banyoro.

Again, among the Banyoro, another tribe of Central Africa, in the Uganda Protectorate, the ghosts of dead kings were consulted as oracles by their living successors. Over the king's grave a mound of earth was raised, with a flat top which was covered with a grass carpet and overlaid with cow-skins and leopard-skins. This served as the throne where the king's ghost was supposed to take its seat at any ceremony. Before this throne offerings were presented to the ghost, and there also requests were made, when the reigning king wished to consult his father on matters of state or when sickness appeared in the royal household. At the grave a large hut was built, and in it were lodged guards, whose duty it was to watch over the tomb and to present the offerings to the worshipful ghost.[2]

Oracles of dead chiefs among the Basoga.

Among the Basoga of the Central District, in the Uganda Protectorate, the souls of dead chiefs are in like manner consulted as oracles through the medium of women, who act as their interpreters or prophets. When a chief has been dead and buried for some months, his ghost appears to one of his kinsmen and tells him, "I wish to move." On being informed of the ghost's desire, the new chief orders the grave of his predecessor to be opened and the skull removed. When the skull has been dried and enclosed in skins, the chief sends for a woman, who must be a member of the clan to which the nurse of the late chief belonged. To her he commits the duty of guarding the skull, interpreting the wishes of the ghost, and attending to its wants. She also receives a she-goat, a cow, and a hen, which are to provide food for the ghost. Having received her commission and the provender, the woman is escorted to a place called Nakazungu, on the Mpologoma river, where a large house is built for her. There the skull is deposited in a

[1] J. Roscoe, "Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxi. (1901) pp. 129 *sq.*; *id.*, "Further Notes on the Manners and Customs of the Baganda," *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxxii. (1902) pp. 44 *sqq.*; *id.*, *The Baganda* (London, 1911), pp. 109-113, 283-285; *id.*, "Worship of the Dead as practised by some African tribes," *Harvard African Studies*, i. (1917) pp. 39 *sq.* Compare *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, Third Edition, ii. 167 *sqq.*

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 53.

shrine or temple, which is deemed the house of the ghost, and there the woman becomes possessed by the ghost and reveals his wishes. Thither, too, the new chief sends offerings to the spirit of his father. However, the skull and the ghost remain in this place of honour only during the life of his successor. When the next chief dies, the old skull and the old ghost are compelled to vacate the premises and shift their quarters to a wooded island in the river, where the skulls and ghosts of all former chiefs are permanently lodged. No house there shelters them from the inclemency of the weather. Each skull is simply deposited in the open, with a spear stuck in the ground beside it. The prophetess who attended to its wants in the temple accompanies the skull to its long home in the island, and there she may continue to interpret the wishes and views of the ghost to any who care to consult it. But few people think it worth while to make a pilgrimage to the old ghosts in this oracular Golgotha or Place of Skulls in the forest; most persons prefer to ask the advice of the new ghost in the temple. Thus fashion runs after novelty in the world of the dead as in the world of the living.[1] Among the Basoga of the North-Western District, as among the Baganda, it is not the skull but the lower jawbone of a dead chief which is kept to serve as the means of communication with his spirit. It is cleansed, wrapt in a skin decorated with cowry-shells, and conveyed to a temple in a remote part of the district, where the jawbones of all former chiefs are preserved. The guardian is a priest and medium; he holds converse with the ghost, and conveys any message to the ruling chief.[2]

The lower jawbone kept as a means of communication with the spirit of the dead.

Among the Bantu tribes who inhabit the great tableland of Northern Rhodesia the spirits of dead chiefs sometimes take possession of the bodies of live men or women and prophesy through their mouths. When the spirit thus comes upon a man, he begins to roar like a lion, and the women gather together and beat the drums, shouting that the chief has come to visit the village. The possessed person will predict future wars, and warn the people of approaching visitations by lions. While the inspiration

Oracles of dead chiefs among the Bantu tribes of Northern Rhodesia.

[1] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 227 *sq.*

[2] J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, pp. 226 *sq.*

lasts, the medium may eat nothing cooked by fire, but only unfermented dough. However, this gift of prophecy usually descends on women rather than on men. Such prophetesses give out that they are possessed by the soul of some dead chief, and when they feel the divine afflatus they whiten their faces to attract attention, and they smear themselves with flour, which has a religious and sanctifying potency. One of their number beats a drum, and the others dance, singing at the same time a weird song, with curious intervals. Finally, when they have worked themselves up to the requisite pitch of religious exaltation, the possessed woman drops to the ground, and bursts out into a low and almost inarticulate chant, which amid the awestruck silence of the bystanders is interpreted by the medicine-men as the voice of the spirit.[1]

Oracles of dead kings among the Barotsé of the Zambesi.

Again, among the Barotsé, a Bantu tribe of the Upper Zambesi, the souls of dead kings are consulted and give their responses through the mouth of a priest. Each royal tomb is indeed an oracle of the dead. It stands in a beautiful grove, and is enclosed by a palisade covered with fine mats, like the palisade which surrounds the residence of a living king. Such an enclosure is sacred; the people are forbidden to enter it, lest they should disturb the ghost of him who sleeps below. A priest acts as intermediary between the royal ghost and the people who come to pray to him at the shrine. He alone has the right to enter the sacred enclosure; the profane multitude must stand at a respectful distance. Even the king himself, when he comes to consult one of his ancestors, is forbidden to set foot on the holy ground. He kneels down at the entrance, claps his hands, and gives the royal salute, which is solemnly returned by the priest from within the enclosure. Then the suppliant, whether king or commoner, makes his petition to the worshipful spirit and deposits his offering; for no man may pray at the shrine with empty hands. Inside the enclosure, near the entrance, is a hole, which is supposed to serve as a channel of communication with the spirit of the deified king. In it the offerings are deposited. Often they consist of

[1] Cullen Gouldsbury and Hubert Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia* (London, 1911), p. 83.

milk, which is poured into the hole; more solid offerings, such as flesh, clothes, and glass beads, become the property of the priest after they have lain for a decent time beside the sacred aperture. The spirits of dead kings are thus consulted on matters of public concern as well as by private persons on their own affairs. All over the country these temple-tombs may be seen, each in its shady grove; hence no man need have far to go to seek for ghostly counsel at an oracle of the dead.[1]

Evocation of the dead among the negroes of West Africa.

Among the Ewe-speaking negroes of South Togoland, when the funeral celebration is over, it is customary to summon up the soul of the deceased. His relations take cooked food to the priest and tell him that they wish to bring water for the spirit of their departed brother. The priest accordingly receives food, palm-wine, and cowry-shells at their hands, and with them retires into his room and shuts the door behind him. Then he evokes the ghost, who on his arrival begins to weep and to converse with the priest, sometimes making some general observations on the difference between life in the upper and in the under world, sometimes entering into particulars as to the manner of his own death; often he mentions the name of the wicked sorcerer who has killed him by his enchantments. When the dead man's friends outside hear the lamentations and complaints of his ghost proceeding from the room, they are moved to tears and cry out, "We pity you!" Finally, the ghost bids them be comforted and takes his departure.[2]

Consultation of the dead by means of their images.

Among the Kissi, a tribe of negroes on the border of Liberia, the souls of dead chiefs are consulted as oracles by means of the statuettes which are erected on their graves. For the purpose of the consultation the statuettes are placed on a board, which is carried by two men on their heads; if the bearers remain motionless, the answer of the spirit is assumed to be "No"; if they sway to and fro, the answer is "Yes."[3] In the island of Ambrym, one of the New Hebrides, wooden statues representing ancestors are simi-

[1] Eugène Beguin, *Les Ma-rotsé* (Lausanne and Fontainès, 1903), pp. 120-123.

[2] J. Spieth, *Die Religion der Eweer in Süd-Togo* (Leipsic, 1911), p. 238.

[3] Dr. H. Néel, "Note sur deux peuplades de la frontière Libérienne, les Kissi et les Toma," *L'Anthropologie*, xxiv. (1913) p. 461.

larly employed as a means of communicating with the souls of the dead. When a man is in trouble, he blows a whistle at nightfall near the statue of an ancestor, and if he hears a noise, he believes that the soul of the dead kinsman has entered into the image; thereupon he recounts his woes to the effigy and prays the spirit to help him.[1]

Evocation of the dead among the Maoris of New Zealand.

The Maoris of New Zealand feared and worshipped the spirits of their dead kinsfolk, especially dead chiefs and warriors, who were believed to be constantly watching over the living tribesmen, protecting them in war and marking any breach of the sacred law of taboo. These spirits dwelt normally below the earth, but they could return to the upper air at pleasure and enter into the bodies of men or even into the substance of inanimate objects. Some tribes kept in their houses small carved images of wood, each of which was dedicated to the spirit of an ancestor, who was supposed to enter into the image on particular occasions in order to hold converse with the living. Such an ancestral spirit (*atua*) might communicate with the living either in dreams or more directly by talking with them in their waking hours. Their voice, however, was not like that of mortals, but a mysterious kind of sound, half whistle, half whisper. The English writer, to whom we owe these particulars, was privileged thus to converse with the souls of two chiefs who had been dead for several years. The interview took place through the agency of an old woman, a Maori witch of Endor, at whose bidding the ancestral spirits of the tribe were supposed to appear. She dwelt in a solitary hut, where the Englishman, accompanied by two Maoris, found her seated composedly by a blazing fire, while two female slaves opposite her were busy talking and weaving potato baskets. It was night, and when the witch, after making some objections, consented to exert her necromantic powers, she began by removing all the blazing sticks from the fire, till only the glowing embers spread a dim light through the room. Then she sat quite still, and the two slave women imitated her example, ceasing to ply both their fingers and their tongues. In the silence which ensued a sound was heard, as if some-

A Maori witch of Endor.

[1] Felix Speiser, *Two Years with the Natives in the Western Pacific* (London, 1913), p. 206.

thing heavy had fallen on the roof of the hut, and then a rustling noise, such as might have been made by a rat, crept along the thatch till it stopped just over the heads of the inmates. The old woman now covered her head and face in her blanket, and bent herself nearly double, with her head resting on her knees. And immediately from the spot where the rustling noise had ceased there issued sounds imitative of a voice, but whistled instead of being articulated in ordinary tones. The moment it was heard, it was recognized as the voice of a certain dead chief, the father of one of the two Maoris who had accompanied the Englishman to the witch's cottage. The ghost welcomed the stranger after the usual manner of the tribe. But when at the whispered suggestion of the chief's son, who was a Christian, the Englishman had clapped his hand on the witch's mouth, the whistling voice demanded, "Who has put his hand to touch me?" This seemed to the sceptical Englishman a proof that the voice came from the mouth of the old woman; and he noticed that whenever the whistling voice was heard, he could not distinguish her breathing, but that immediately on the voice ceasing her breathing was heard accelerated, as if after an exertion. However, concealing his doubts, he gravely addressed the supposed owner of the voice, and requested him to enter the hut and allow himself to be seen as well as heard. But the voice replied that he was a lizard, and could not come nearer for fear of injuring the inquirer. Neither persuasions nor taunts could move him from his fixed resolution not to harm his son's friend, which was the only reason he assigned for not revealing himself to the eyes of the doubting Englishman; and he changed the subject of discourse by observing, "Now that you have given me the trouble to come so far to visit you, it is surely your intention to make me a fine present—a cask of tobacco, or perhaps a coat." "Of what possible service will a coat be to a spirit?" rejoined the ghost's son, laughing, "how will you be able to put it on?" To this pointed question the ghost made no reply, and presently took his leave, promising to send another spirit, who might feel less scruple at exhibiting himself to the gaze of the stranger. After a short pause of silent expectation, something was heard to fall plump

like a stone on the roof of the hut. Then there was again a rustling noise, as before, which, after travelling along the roof and down the walls, reascended the roof and halted nearly over the old woman. Being entreated to enter the hut and show himself, this second spirit declined to comply with the request, alleging that he was a spider and that he could not do as requested without danger to the inquirer. After a conversation in which the ghost's supernatural knowledge did not save him from telling a direct falsehood, he too departed, and in a few minutes a small squeaking voice, like that of an infant, was heard, which, after perpetrating and laughing at a ribald jest, appeared to retreat and die away till it was lost in the distance. No more spirits spoke after that, and the old woman, removing her blanket from her face, and raising her head, as though she had just awaked from a trance, asked the Englishman if he was satisfied.[1]

Evocation of the spirit of a Maori chief.

An Irishman, who lived long among the Maoris and knew them intimately, witnessed many such exhibitions of necromancy, and has described one of them in detail. The priests, he tells us, undertook to call up the spirit of any dead person for a proper fee. On this particular occasion the ghost evoked was that of a very popular young chief (*rangatira*), whom the Irishman had known intimately, and who had been killed in battle. At the request of his nearest friends, a priest engaged to call up the dead man's spirit to speak to them and answer certain questions which they wished to put. The interview took place at night in a large house common to the whole population, where fires cast a flickering light through the gloom. The priest retired to the darkest corner. All was expectation, and the silence was broken only by the sobbing of the sister and other female relations of the dead man. About thirty persons were seated on the rush-strewn floor. At last, when the fire had died down, leaving only a heap of glowing charcoal, a voice issued from the darkness solemnly saluting the assembly. It was answered by a cry of affection and despair from the dead chief's sister, a fine handsome young woman, who

[1] Edward Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders*, Second Edition (London, 1856), pp. 81-96.

rushed, with both arms distended, into the darkness from which the voice proceeded. She was instantly seized round the waist and restrained by main force by her brother, till, moaning and fainting, she lay still on the ground. At the same instant another female voice was heard from a young girl, who was held by the wrists by two young men, her brothers, "Is it you? is it you? truly is it you? *ane! ane!* they hold me, they restrain me; wonder not that I have not followed you; they restrain me, they watch me, but I go to you. The sun shall not rise, the sun shall not rise, *ane! ane!*" Here she fell insensible on the floor, and with the sister was carried out. Afterwards the ghost conversed with his brother in strange melancholy tones, like the sound of the wind blowing into a hollow vessel, and he answered a woman's inquiry about her dead sister. Having satisfied her affectionate anxiety, the ghost next requested that his tame pig and his double-barrelled gun might be given to the priest. The Irishman now struck in and questioned the ghost as to a book which the dead chief had left behind him. The ghost indicated correctly the place where the volume had been deposited, but on being pressed to mention some of its contents he took an abrupt leave of the assembly, his farewell sounding first from the room, next from deep beneath the ground, then from high in air, and finally dying away in the darkness of night. The company broke up after midnight, and the Irishman retired to rest. But he was soon wakened by the report of a musket, followed by the shouts of men and the screams of women. Hastening in the direction from which the sounds proceeded, he saw in the midst of a crowd, by the light of a burning house, the lifeless and bleeding body of the young girl who had said that she would follow the spirit to the spirit land. She had kept her word, having secretly procured a loaded musket and blown herself to pieces. The voice of the priest said, close to the Irishman, "She has followed her *rangatira*."[1]

Evocation of the dead in Nukahiva, one of the Marquesas Islands.

In Nukahiva, one of the Marquesas Islands, the priests and priestesses claimed to possess the power of evoking the

[1] *Old New Zealand*, by a Pakeha Maori, with an Introduction by the Earl of Pembroke (London, 1884), pp. 122-128.

spirits of the dead, who took up their abode for the time being in the bodies of the mediums and so conversed with their surviving relatives. The occasion for summoning up a ghost was usually the sickness of a member of the family, on whose behalf his friends desired to have the benefit of ghostly advice. A French writer, who lived in the island in the first half of the nineteenth century, was present at one of these interviews with a departed spirit and has described it. The meeting took place at night in the house of a sick man, for the purpose of ascertaining the issue of his illness. A priestess acted as medium, and by her direction the room was darkened by the extinction of the fires. The spirit invoked was that of a lady who had died a few years before, leaving no less than twelve widowed husbands to mourn her loss. Of these numerous widowers the sick man was one; indeed he had been her favourite husband, but her ghost now announced to him his approaching death without the least ambiguity or circumlocution. Her voice appeared at first to come from a distance and then to approach nearer and nearer, till it settled on the roof of the house.[1]

Evocation of the dead in New Guinea and Celebes.

At the initiation ceremonies, which they observe every year, the Marindineeze, a tribe on the southern coast of Dutch New Guinea, summon up the souls of their forefathers from the underworld by knocking hard on the ground with the lower ends of coco-nut leaves for an hour together. The evocation takes place by night.[2] Similarly at their festivals the Bare'e-speaking Toradjas of Central Celebes evoke the souls of dead chiefs and heroes, the guardian spirits of the village, by beating on the floor of the temple with a long stick.[3]

Evocation of the dead among the Sea Dyaks and Kayans of Borneo.

The Sea Dyaks of Borneo believe that the souls of their dead friends live and revisit them on earth. They are

[1] Max Radiguet, *Les Derniers Sauvages, la Vie et les Mœurs aux Iles Marquises*, Nouvelle Edition (Paris, 1882), pp. 226-232. The writer first went to the Marquesas Islands in 1842.

[2] Jos. Viegen, "Oorsprongs- en Afstammingslegenden van den Marindinees (Zuid Nieuw-Guinea)," *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Tweede Serie, xxix. (1912) p. 149; A. J. Gooszen, "De Majo-mysterien ter Nieuw-Guinea's Zuidkust," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, lxix. (1914) p. 377.

[3] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 330.

invoked in times of peril and distress; and on the hilltops or in the solitude of the jungle a man will often go by himself and spend the night, hoping that the spirit of a dead relative may visit him and reveal to him in a dream some charm by which he may extricate himself from his difficulties and grow rich and great.[1] Among the Kayans of Borneo, when a dispute has arisen concerning the division of a dead man's property, recourse is sometimes had to a professional wizard or witch, who summons up the ghost of the deceased and questions him as to his intentions in the disposal of his estate. The evocation, however, cannot take place until after the harvest which follows upon the death. When the time comes for it, a small model of a house is made for the temporary accommodation of the ghost and is placed in the gallery of the common house, beside the door of the dead man's chamber. For the refreshment of the spirit, moreover, food, drink, and cigarettes are laid out in the little house. The wizard takes up his post beside the tiny dwelling and chants his invocation, calling upon the soul of the deceased to enter the soul-house, and mentioning the names of the members of his family. From time to time he looks in, and at last announces that all the food and drink have been consumed. The people believe that the ghost has now entered the soul-house; and the wizard pretends to listen to the whispering of the soul within the house, starting and clucking from time to time. Finally, he declares the will of the ghost in regard to the distribution of the property, speaking in the first person and mimicking the mode of speech and other peculiarities of the dead man. The directions so obtained are usually followed, and thus the dispute is settled.[2]

Evocation of the dead among the Milanos of Sarawak.

Among the Milanos of Sarawak, a few days or weeks after a death an old man or woman will sometimes dream that the soul of the deceased lacks food or clothing, which appear to be as necessary in the other world as they are in this. Accordingly a medium, in the shape of a medicine-man or medicine-woman, is called in to communicate with

[1] Edwin H. Gomes, *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo* (London, 1911), p. 142.

[2] Charles Hose and William McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo* (London, 1912), ii. 38 *sq.*

the poor ghost and to supply his wants. The ceremony takes place after sunset in the presence of a number of friends. An Englishman, who witnessed one such ghostly interview, has described it for us. On this occasion there were two mediums, both men. With their heads completely shrouded in a cloth, they took up their position side by side on a small mat, on which they were supposed to float down the River of Death in the nether world. Each of them had provided himself with a paddle for the voyage, and sitting on the mat went through all the motions of paddling. As they paddled, they talked, remarking on the swiftness of the stream, noticing the overhanging trees past which they shot, and hurriedly warning each other of sunken rocks. Then came an upset; the two men, amid the excitement of the spectators, swam for their lives, splashing about real water which had been introduced into the room for the purpose. However, they succeeded in righting the bark, and resumed the voyage with nothing worse than a wetting. At last they landed in the under world. Then the tenor of their conversation changed. They now remarked on the departed spirits whom they recognized and some of whom they accosted. "There goes So-and-So," they would say, "as lame as ever." "What an awful wound Such-and-Such a man has!" And from time to time they would grasp at some imaginary object in the air and exhibit a little tobacco or sireh leaf to the wondering and credulous onlookers. After about half an hour of this pantomime they dropped on their knees and went groping about the room, clutching at various things, till one of them announced that he had caught the soul they were looking for. Having secured the spirit between his hands, he went and clapped it on the head of the nearest relative of the deceased, tying a cloth on the man's head to prevent the fluttering thing from escaping. Thus the most difficult part of the task imposed on the mediums was now accomplished—they had captured the ghost; to converse with the captive was comparatively easy, and though his replies were not audible to the assembly, they were perfectly so to the mediums. "So sorry to see you ill," one of them would remark to the spirit, "is there anything we can do for you?" or again,

The voyage down the River of Death.

"What sort of a time have you had latterly?" and so forth. Finally, the mediums unmuffled their heads and informed the relatives concerning the welfare of the deceased, instructing them to lay a garment, a cooking-pot, or perhaps still better some dollars on the grave for the use of their departed kinsman in the other world, after which his spirit would rest in peace.[1]

Evocation of the dead among the Bataks of Sumatra.

The Bataks of Central Sumatra believe that the souls of the dead, being incorporeal, can only communicate with the living through the person of a living man, and for the purpose of such communication they choose an appropriate medium, who, in serving as a vehicle for the ghostly message, imitates the voice, the manner, the walk, and even the dress of the deceased so closely, that his surviving relations are often moved to tears by the resemblance. By the mouth of the medium the spirit reveals his name, mentions his relations, and describes the pursuits he followed on earth. He discloses family secrets which he had kept during life, and the disclosure confirms his kinsfolk in the belief that it is really the ghost of their departed brother who is conversing with them. When a member of the family is sick, the ghost is consulted as to whether the patient will live or die. When an epidemic is raging, the ghost is evoked and sacrifices are offered to him, that he may guard the people against the infection. When a man is childless, he inquires of a ghost through a medium, how he can obtain offspring. When something has been lost or stolen, a ghost is conjured up to tell whether the missing property will be recovered. When any one has missed his way in the forest or elsewhere and has not returned home, it is still to a ghost, through the intervention of a medium, that the anxious friends apply in order to learn where the strayed wayfarer is to be sought. If a medium is questioned as to how the ghost takes possession of him, he says that he sees the ghost approaching and feels as if his body were being dragged away, his feet grow light and leap about, human beings seem small and reddish in colour, the houses appear to be turning round. But the

[1] Rev. Fr. Bernard Mulder and John Hewitt, "Two religious Ceremonies in vogue among the Milanos of Sarawak," *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, No. 57, January, 1911 (Singapore, 1911), pp. 179 *sq.*

possession is not continuous; from time to time during the fit the ghost leaves the medium and plays about. When the fit is over, the medium is often sick and sometimes dies.[1]

Evocation of the dead among the Eskimo.

Necromancy has been practised by man amid Arctic snow and ice as well as in tropical forests and jungles. Among the Eskimo of Labrador we read of a shaman who used to oblige his friends by calling up the spirits of the dead, whenever the living desired to inquire concerning the welfare of the departed, or the whereabouts of absent relatives at sea. He would first blindfold the questioner, and then rap thrice on the ground with a stick. On the third rap the spirit appeared and answered the shaman's questions. Having supplied the information that was wanted, the ghost would be dismissed to his own place by three more raps on the ground. This sort of necromancy was called "conjuring with a stick" (*kilu'xin*). A similar method of evoking the souls of the dead is employed by the Eskimo of Alaska. They believe that the spirits ascend from the under world and pass through the body of the shaman, who converses audibly with them and, having learned all he desires, sends them back to their subterranean abode by a stamp of his foot. The answers of the ghosts to his questions are supposed by sceptics to be produced by ventriloquism.[2]

Necromancy in China.

In China, where the worship of the dead forms a principal part of the national religion, the practice of necromancy is naturally common, and the practitioners at the present day appear to be chiefly old women. Such necromancers, for example, abound in Canton and Amoy.

Evocation of the dead in Canton.

During his residence at Canton, Archdeacon Gray witnessed many exhibitions of their skill, and he describes one of them as follows: "One day, in the month of January 1867, I was the guest of an old lady, a widow, who resided in the western suburb of the city. She desired to confer with her departed husband, who had been dead for several years. The witch who was called in, was of prepossessing appearance and well-dressed; and she commenced immediately to discharge the duties of her vocation. Her first act was to

[1] Joh. Warneck, *Die Religion der Batak* (Leipsic, 1909), pp. 89 *sq.*

[2] E. W. Hawes, *The Labrador Eskimo* (Ottawa, 1916), p. 132 (*Canada, Department of Mines, Geological Survey, Memoir 91*).

erect a temporary altar at the head of the hall in which we were assembled. Upon this she placed two burning tapers, and offerings of fruits and cakes. She then sat on the right side of the altar, and, burying her face in her hands, remained silent for several minutes. Having awakened from her supposed trance or dream, she began to utter in a singing tone some words of incantation, at the same time sprinkling handfuls of rice at intervals upon the floor. She then said that the spirit of the departed was once more in the midst of his family. They were greatly moved, and some of them burst into a flood of tears. Through the witch as a medium, the spirit of the old man then informed the family where he was, and of the state of happiness he was permitted to enjoy in the land of shades. He spoke on several family topics, and dwelt upon the condition of one of his sons who, since his death, had gone to the northern provinces of China—references which evidently astonished the members of the family who were present, and confirmed their belief in the supernatural powers of the female impostor before them. There can be no doubt that she had made suitable inquiries beforehand. After exhorting his widow to dry her tears, and on no account to summon him again from the world of shades, in which he was tolerably happy, the spirit of the old man retired." [1]

Evocation of the dead in the province of Shantung.

According to the account of a native Chinese author, it is customary in the province of Shantung to consult the ancestral spirits (*shen*), in the female apartments, when a member of the family is sick. The medium employed for the purpose is an old witch who dances, playing a tambourine and making grimaces, and is therefore called the dancing spirit. "But this practice," he proceeds, "flourishes specially in the capital of the empire, where even young married women in respectable families perform it from time to time. In the hall of the house they place on the table stands which are filled with meat, and goblets full of spirits, and they light large candles, so that it is clearer there than in the daytime; then the woman, tucking up her petticoat, draws up one leg and hops like a *shang-yang*,[2] while two

[1] J. H. Gray, *China* (London, 1878), ii. 22 *sq.*

[2] "A fabulous one-legged bird."

grasp her arms, and support her on either side. She babbles in a monotonous tedious way, now in a sing song, now as if uttering conjurations, now with a flow of words, then with only a few, without any modulation of tune. Meanwhile drums are wildly banged in the apartment, so that their thunder stuns one, and in their noise the words which come from her opening and closing lips are far from distinct. In the end she droops her head, looks askance, and wants help to stand erect; but for her supporters she would tumble. But suddenly she stretches out her neck and jumps one or two feet into the air, and all the women in the apartment shiver and regard her with terror; thereupon she exclaims, 'The ancestor comes and eats!' Now they blow out the lights, so that it is pitch dark everywhere. Silent the bystanders stand in the dark, and speak not a word to each other; indeed, owing to the confused noise, nothing they might say would be understood. After a while they hear the woman mention with a shrill voice the (deceased) father or mother-in-law, or the husband or sister-in-law, by the name by which he or she was familiarly known, this being a sign to the whole company to re-light the candles. With outstretched necks they now ask the medium whether good or evil is to be expected, and in the mean time they inspect the goblets, baskets and cups, to find them altogether emptied; and they try to read on her face whether the spirit is contented or not; and, full of respect, they address a series of questions to her, which she answers as readily as an echo."[1]

Evocation of the dead in Amoy.

The practice of calling up the spirits of the dead for consultation is said to be very common in Amoy, where the necromancers are professional women. Among the male sex the reputation of these ladies for strict veracity seems not to stand very high, for to tell a man, in common parlance, that he is "bringing up the dead" is almost equivalent to saying that he is telling a lie. Hence these female necromancers often prefer to confine their ministrations to their own sex, lest they should expose their high mysteries to the derision of masculine sceptics. In that case the session is held with closed doors in the private apartments of the women; other-

[1] J. J. M. de Groot, *The Religious System of China*, vi. (Leyden, 1910) pp. 1330 *sq.*

wise it takes place in the main hall, at the domestic altar, and all inmates of the house are free to attend. Many families, indeed, make a rule to question, by means of these witches, every deceased relation at least once not long after his or her death, in order to ascertain whether the souls are comfortable in the other world, and whether anything can be done by family affection to ameliorate their condition. An auspicious day having been chosen for the ceremony, the apartment is swept and watered, because spirits entertain an aversion to dirt and dust. To allure the ghost, food and dainties, together with burning incense, are placed on the domestic altar, or, should the conference take place in a secluded room, on an ordinary table. In the latter case, when the medium has come, it is necessary for one of the women to go to the altar, where the tablets are deposited in which the souls of the dead members of the family are believed to reside. Having lighted two candles and three incense-sticks at the altar, she invites the ghost to leave its tablet and follow her. Then, with the incense between her fingers, she slowly walks back into the room, and plants the sticks in a bowl or cup with some uncooked rice. The medium now goes to work, chanting conjurations, while she strums a lyre or beats a drum. In time her movements grow convulsive, she rocks to and fro, and sweat bursts from her body. These things are regarded as evidence that the ghost has arrived. Two women support the medium and place her in a chair, where she falls into a state of distraction or slumber, with her arms resting on the table. A black veil is next thrown over her head, and in her mesmeric state she can now answer questions, shivering, as she does so, rocking in her seat, and drumming the table nervously with her hands or with a stick. Through her mouth the ghost informs his relations of his state in the other world and what they can do to improve it or even to redeem him entirely from his sufferings. He mentions whether the sacrifices which are offered to him reach their destination intact or suffer loss and damage in process of transmission through the spiritual post; he states his preferences and he enumerates his wants. He also favours his kinsfolk with his advice on domestic affairs, though his language is

often ambiguous and his remarks have sometimes little or no bearing on the questions submitted to him. Now and then the medium holds whispered monologues, or rather conversations with the ghost. At last she suddenly shivers, awakes, and raising herself up declares that the ghost has gone. Having pocketed the rice and the incense-sticks in the bowl, she receives her fee and takes her departure. "The various phases in the condition of the medium during the conference are, of course, taken by the onlookers for the several moments of her connection with the other world. Yet we remain entitled to consider them to be symptoms of psychical aberration and nervous affection. Her spasms and convulsions pass for possession, either by the ghost which is consulted, or by the spirit with which she usually has intercourse, and which thus imparts to her the faculty of second sight by which she sees that ghost. And her mesmeric fits confessedly are the moments when her soul leaves her, in order to visit the other world, there to see the ghost and speak with it. Her whispering lips indicate conversation with her spirit, or with the ghost which is consulted. It may be asked, why, since this ghost dwells in its tablet on the altar, her soul should travel to the other world to see it. We can give no answer."[1]

Evocation of the dead by means of a familiar spirit in China.

From this account it appears that a Chinese witch sometimes calls up the souls of the dead, not directly, but through the mediation of a familiar spirit which she has at her command. Similarly Archdeacon Gray tells us that "in China, as in other lands, there are persons—always old women—who profess to have familiar spirits, and who pretend that they can call up the spirits of the dead to converse with the living."[2] In this respect Chinese witches resemble the ancient Hebrew witches, who would seem to have depended on the help of familiar spirits for the evocation of ghosts; for when Saul desired the witch of Endor to summon up the ghost of Samuel, he said to her, "Divine unto me, I pray thee, by the familiar spirit, and bring me up whomsoever I shall name unto thee."[3]

[1] J. J. M. de Groot, *The Religious System of China*, vi. (Leyden, 1910) pp. 1332-1335.

[2] J. H. Gray, *China* (London, 1878), ii. 22.

[3] 1 Samuel xxviii. 8.

Evocation of the dead among the Mordvins of Russia.

Among the Mordvins of Russia down to the present time the soul of a deceased person appears to be regularly evoked on the fortieth day after his or her death. But the ceremony of evocation is not everywhere equally elaborate; in some places it has so dwindled that the stunted relics of the old custom might be unintelligible, if it were not possible to interpret them by the fuller forms which have survived elsewhere. And even where the ceremony is carried out with the greatest completeness and solemnity, it may be doubted whether to the minds of the people the evocation does not partake of the nature of a dramatic performance rather than of a magical rite; for we must bear in mind that even when the faith in magic has been shaken or undermined, the ritual to which it gave birth tends long to survive through the sheer force of conservatism which is one of the pillars of human institutions. Thus what had once been regarded with implicit belief and intense excitement as the visit paid by a real ghost to his mourning relations may come in time to be viewed with languid interest as a mere dramatic spectacle, a masquerade in which, instead of a medium supposed to be actually possessed by the soul of the dead, an actor consciously plays the part of an apparition. Which of these stages of belief or of disbelief, of faith or of scepticism, the ritual of evocation among the Mordvins occupies at the present time, it might be difficult to determine; perhaps it hovers somewhere between the two, an element of doubt and uncertainty troubling alike the faith of the believer and the scepticism of the infidel. After all, we can seldom draw a sharp line of demarcation between the beliefs of mankind concerning the supernatural; in general they melt and shade off into each other by gradations as fine and imperceptible as the hues of the rainbow.

Description of the evocation of a ghost among the Mordvins.

The following is the account which a Russian writer gives of the evocation of the ghost among the Mordvins. On the eve of the fortieth day after a death, the head of the family invites the brother or nephew, who most nearly resembles the deceased, to represent his departed kinsman on the morrow, acting and speaking in his name. At the same time the whole family repairs to the burial ground to invite the dead man to the festival. They kneel before the

The invitation to the dead man.

tomb, cover the earth with their kisses, and entreat the dear departed to return among the living; the door of his house stands open to receive him, all his friends will await him on the threshold with candles in their hands.

The visit of the dead man to the house.

Next morning at dawn the pretended dead man come to life appears at the threshold of the house; he exchanges his clothes for those worn by the deceased, and stretches himself on the bedding on which the man whom he personates expired. All treat him kindly, all bring him little presents and lay them, with deep bows, on the table before him, all question him as to the life he leads in the other world. In the evening they all sit down to feast; the guests eat and drink heartily, but the hero of the evening is served only with a few drops of *pure*. He tells them of the life beyond the grave, of the fine crops that grow in the far country, of the joy of being in the midst of friends, of all the stables and sheds and corn and cattle of which he is there the happy possessor. To those who ask for news of their dead relatives he gives full replies: "Your father has excellent horses there, just as he had here, he is busy carting; your father is ruined; such and such an old man keeps bees; Vassili gets drunk every day; Ivan is married, and his wife is pretty." Towards midnight all gather closer to hear the messages and wishes of the defunct, the old people in front, the young people behind, all on their knees. The supposed dead man counsels the living to live in peace, to take good care of their cattle, and not to steal; he wishes them plenty of *pure* and strong drink. Then the feasting is resumed and protracted till the break of day, when the last farewells are exchanged.

Providing the ghost with the necessaries of life.

But before escorting their departed brother back to the grave, the family holds a consultation for the purpose of providing the ghost with the necessaries of life in the other world. With regard to food and clothing they think they have done enough for him at the festival, but there is still one article which must not be forgotten, and that is firewood; for apparently Mordvin ghosts are apt to suffer more from cold than from heat in the land of souls. Accordingly they arrange that the ghost should go and chop his own firewood in the forest. The advantage of this arrangement

The ghost chops his own firewood in the forest.

is obvious; for should his stock of fuel afterwards run short in the other world, he will have nobody to blame but himself. So a chair, furnished with a cushion, is brought into the room; the ghost, or rather his human representative, seats himself in it, and being given a knife in his hand he is carried to the place in the forest which has been selected for the display of his woodcraft. Here a branch has been stuck in the ground to represent a tree; and the supposed ghost, alighting from his chair, sets to work to hew it down with a great deal of bustle, dealing heavy strokes and panting as he strikes. At last the tree, or rather the branch, is felled and chopped into sticks; the ghostly woodman reseats himself in the chair and is carried back to the house, where the firewood is deposited on the floor, and the festival once more resumed. But the dead has still to be provided with money, and the delicate task of collecting it for his behoof must now be performed. For the purpose of the collection, a money-box, made of birch bark, is placed in the middle of the room, and the branch cut by the dead man's representative is fastened to one of its sides. Then a fire of brushwood is kindled close by, and all is ready. Every person present now walks thrice round the box, seizes the branch with his right hand, leaps over the fire, and finally, his courage having been screwed up to the sticking point, drops his mite into the collection. By leaping over the fire each man or woman is believed to be delivered from death, which has entered the house along with the representative of the dead man and is on the look-out for other victims among the inmates.

Providing the ghost with money.

Next the head of the family sacrifices a bull at the doorway in such a way that the animal's blood overflows a table of offerings and is used to make fritters, while its flesh is cut up, boiled in huge pots, and devoured by the assembly on the spot. When the repast is over, the ghost declares that his time has come to return to the grave. At that, all drop on their knees, and implore his blessing. The cart which is to convey him to his long home is loaded with bread, mutton, beer, and other provisions for his support on the journey; old women fling their arms round his neck, he is laid at full length on a feather-bed and so transported

The sacrifice of the bull.

The return to the grave.

to the cart. The most privileged of the guests take their places beside him in the vehicle, and the procession gets under way for the graveyard. Arrived there, the supposed dead man is seated on his grave with his back to the east. A tablecloth is spread, some food is placed on it, and he is requested to partake of his last meal, his friends setting him the example. Now the moment has come for the final farewell. The supposed dead man is entreated to return when the wheat is ripe, and he is promised his share of the harvest. Thereupon he salutes his family and lies down on the grave, but only to start up again and replace with his own hands the feather-bed and blankets on the cart.[1]

Wide diffusion of necromancy.

These examples may serve to show how widely spread the practice of necromancy has been among the civilized as well as the barbarous races of mankind.[2]

[1] Jean N. Smirnov, *Les Populations Finnoises des bassins de la Volga et de la Kama, Première Partie* (Paris, 1898) pp. 365-369.

[2] Within the last seventy years there has been a recrudescence of necromancy among the civilized peoples of Western Europe and America. Those who care to follow the sordid history of the movement—a melancholy compound of credulity and fraud—will find it expounded, or rather exposed, with great frankness by Mr. Edward Clodd in his book *The Question* (London, 1917). It is to be feared that, so long as the world lasts, there will always be an ample supply of knavery to meet the demand of folly. "The credulity of dupes," as Burke justly observed, "is as inexhaustible as the invention of knaves" (*Letter to a Member of the National Assembly*, in *The Works of Edmund Burke*, New Edition, London, 1801–1827, vol. vi. p. 10).

CHAPTER IX

THE SIN OF A CENSUS

Supposed aversion of Jehovah to the numbering of the people.

FROM two well-known narratives in the Books of Samuel and Chronicles[1] we learn that at one period of his career Jehovah cherished a singular antipathy to the taking of a census, which he appears to have regarded as a crime of even deeper dye than boiling milk or jumping on a threshold.[2] We read that Jehovah, or Satan, inspired King David with the unhappy idea of counting his people. Whatever the precise source of the inspiration may have been—for on that point the sacred writers differ—the result, or at least the sequel, was disastrous. The numbering of the people was immediately followed by a great pestilence, and popular opinion viewed the calamity as a righteous retribution for the sin of the census. The excited imagination of the plague-stricken people even beheld in the clouds the figure of the Destroying Angel with his sword stretched out over Jerusalem,[3] just as in the Great Plague of London, if we may trust Defoe, a crowd in the street fancied they saw the same dreadful apparition hovering in the air.[4] It was not till the contrite king had confessed his sin and offered sacrifice to appease the angry deity, that the Angel of Death put up his sword and the mourners ceased to go about the streets of Jerusalem.

[1] 2 Samuel xxiv.; 1 Chronicles xxi.

[2] As to these two latter enormities, see below, vol. iii. pp. 1 *sqq.*, 111 *sqq.*

[3] 1 Chronicles xxi. 16.

[4] Daniel Defoe, *History of the Plague in London* (Edinburgh, 1810), pp. 33 *sq.* But Defoe probably copied the narrative in Chronicles. The Mohammedan Toradjas of Central Celebes believe in the existence of certain spirits who cause sickness and death by invisible sword-cuts in the air. See N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes*, i. 326 *sq.*

General aversion of ignorant people to count themselves, their cattle, or their possessions.

The objection which Jehovah, or rather the Jews, entertained to the taking of a census appears to be simply a particular case of the general aversion which many ignorant people feel to allowing themselves, their cattle, or their possessions to be counted. This curious superstition—for such it is—seems to be common among the black races of Africa.

Aversion of the peoples of the Congo to count themselves or their children.

For example, among the Bakongo, of the Lower Congo, "it is considered extremely unlucky for a woman to count her children one, two, three, and so on, for the evil spirits will hear and take some of them away by death. The people themselves do not like to be counted; for they fear that counting will draw to them the attention of the evil spirits, and as a result of the counting some of them will soon die. In 1908 the Congo State officials, desiring to number the people for the purpose of levying a tax, sent an officer with soldiers to count them. The natives would have resisted the officer, but he had too many soldiers with him; and it is not improbable that fights have taken place between whites and blacks in other parts of Africa, not that they resisted the taxation, but because they objected to be counted for fear the spirits would hear and kill them."[1] Similarly among the Boloki or Bangala of the Upper Congo, "the native has a very strong superstition and prejudice against counting his children, for he believes that if he does so, or if he states the proper number, the evil spirits will hear it and some of his children will die; hence when you ask him such a simple question as, 'How many children have you?' you stir up his superstitious fears, and he will answer: 'I don't know.' If you press him, he will tell you sixty, or one hundred children, or any other number that jumps to his tongue; and even then he is thinking of those who, from the native view of kinship, are regarded as his children, and desiring to deceive, not you, but those ubiquitous and prowling evil spirits, he states a large number that leaves a wide margin."[2]

Aversion of East African tribes to count themselves or their cattle.

Again, the Masai of East Africa count neither men nor beasts, believing that if they did so the men or beasts would die. Hence they reckon a great multitude of people or a

[1] John H. Weeks, *Among the Primitive Bakongo* (London, 1914), p. 292.

[2] John H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals* (London, 1913), p. 136.

large herd of cattle only in round numbers; of smaller groups of men or beasts they can reckon the totals with tolerable accuracy without numbering the individuals of the groups. Only dead men or dead beasts may be counted one by one, because naturally there is no risk of their dying again in consequence of the numeration.[1] The Wa-Sania of British East Africa "most strongly object to being counted, as they believe that one of those who were counted would die shortly afterwards."[2] To the Akamba, another tribe of the same region, the welfare of the cattle is a matter of great concern; hence the people observe certain superstitious rules, the breach of which is believed to entail misfortune on the herds. One of these rules is that the cattle may never be counted; so when the herd returns to the village, the owner will merely cast his eye over it to discover if a beast is missing. And in this tribe the unluckiness of counting is not limited to cattle, it extends to all living creatures, and particularly to girls.[3] On the other hand, another authority on the Akamba tells us that "there does not appear to be any superstition against counting stock; if a man has a large herd he does not know the number, but he or his wives when milking would quickly notice if a beast with certain markings was not present. A man however knows the number of his children but is averse to telling any one outside his family. There is a tradition that a man named Munda wa Ngola, who lived in the Ibeti Hills, had many sons and daughters, and boasted of the size of his family, saying that he and his sons could resist any attack from the Masai; one night however the Masai surprised him and killed him and his people, and the countryside considered that this was a judgement on him."[4] Again, among the Akikuyu, another tribe of British East Africa, "it is difficult to arrive at figures, even approximately correct, with regard to the size of the families. The natural method of conversing with the mothers as to the number of

[1] M. Merker, *Die Masai* (Berlin, 1904), p. 152.

[2] Captain W. E. H. Barrett, "Notes on the Customs and Beliefs of the Wagiriama, etc., British East Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xli. (1911) p. 36.

[3] Hon. Ch. Dundas, "History of Kitui," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xliii. (1913) pp. 501 *sq.*, 526.

[4] C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba and other East African Tribes* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 165.

their children is soon found to be, to say the least, a tactless proceeding. It is considered most unlucky to give such figures, a sentiment similar, no doubt, to the aversion felt in the Old Testament days to the numbering of the people. The inquiry is politely waived, with a request to 'come and see.' . . . The objection to giving family statistics was discovered not to be in force amongst other members than the parents; at any rate it did not seem to affect those Kikuyu boys who were continually in touch with us. These answered readily any questions as to the number of their father's wives, their grandfather's wives, and their respective children, and seemed to have a good acquaintance with their relations."[1] The Gallas of East Africa think that to count cattle is an evil omen, and that it impedes the increase of the herd.[2]

Aversion of the Hottentots to be counted.

To count the members of a community or company is reckoned by the Hottentots to be of very evil augury, for they believe that some member of the company will die. A missionary who once, in ignorance of this superstition, counted his work-people, is said to have paid for his rashness with his life.[3]

Aversion to numbering people and things in North Africa.

The superstitious objection to numbering people seems to be general in North Africa; in Algeria the opposition offered by the natives to all French regulations which require an enumeration of the inhabitants is said to be based in great measure on this aversion to be counted. Nor is this repugnance limited to the counting of persons; it is exhibited also in the counting of measures of grain, an operation which has a sacred character. For example, at Oran the person who counts the measures of grain should be in a state of ceremonial purity, and instead of counting one, two, three, and so on, he says "In the name of God" for "one"; "two blessings" for "two"; "hospitality of the Prophet" for "three"; "we shall gain, please God" for "four"; "in the eye of the Devil" for "five"; "in the eye of his son" for "six"; "it is God who gives us our fill" for "seven"; and so on, up to "twelve," for which the expression is

[1] W. Scoresby Routledge and Katherine Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People* (London, 1910), pp. 135, 136.

[2] Ph. Paulitschke, *Ethnographie Nordost-Afrikas, die geistige Cultur der Danâkil, Galla und Somâl* (Berlin, 1896), p. 31.

[3] Th. Hahn, "Die Nama-Hottentoten," *Globus*, xii. p. 277.

"the perfection for God."[1] So in Palestine, at counting the measures of grain, many Mohammedans say for the first one, "God is one," and for the next, "He has no second," then simply "Three," "Four," and so on. But "there are several unlucky numbers, the first being five, and therefore, instead of saying the number, they often say 'Your hand,' five being the number of the fingers; seven is another unlucky number, strange to say, and is passed over in silence, or the word 'A blessing' is used instead; at nine Moslems often say, 'Pray in the name of Mohammed'; eleven also is not unfrequently omitted, the measurer saying, 'There are ten,' and then passing on to twelve."[2] Perhaps such substitutes for the ordinary numbers are intended to deceive evil spirits who may be lying in wait to steal or harm the corn, and who are presumably too dull-witted to comprehend these eccentric modes of numeration.

Mode of counting measures of grain in Palestine.

In the Shortlands group of islands, in the Western Pacific, the building of a chief's house is attended by a variety of ceremonies and observances. The roof is heavily thatched at each gable with thatch made of the leaves of the ivory-nut palm. In collecting these leaves the builders are not allowed to count the number, as the counting would be deemed unlucky; yet if the number of leaves collected should fall short of the number required, the house, though nearing completion, would be at once abandoned.[3] Thus the loss entailed by a miscalculation may be heavy, and from its possible extent we can judge how serious must, in the opinion of the natives, be the objection to counting the leaves, since rather than count them they are prepared to sacrifice the fruit of their labour. Among the Cherokee Indians of North America it is a rule that "melons and squashes must not be counted or examined too closely, while still growing upon the vine, or they will

Aversion to counting things or people in the Shortlands and among the Indians of North America.

[1] Edmond Doutté, *Magie et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord* (Algiers, 1908), pp. 179 *sq.* For special expressions used in counting measures of corn in Morocco, see Edward Westermarck, *Ceremonies and Beliefs connected with Agriculture, certain Dates of the Solar Year, and the Weather in Morocco* (Helsingfors, 1913), pp. 41 *sqq.*

[2] C. T. Wilson, *Peasant Life in the Holy Land* (London, 1906), pp. 212 *sq.*

[3] George Brown, D.D., *Melanesians and Polynesians* (London, 1910), p. 204.

cease to thrive."[1] Once on a time the officer in charge of Fort Simpson, in British Columbia, took a census of the Indians in the neighbourhood, and very soon afterwards great numbers of them were swept away by measles. Of course the Indians attributed the calamity to their having been numbered,[2] just as the Hebrews in King David's time ascribed the wasting pestilence to the sin of the census. The Omaha Indians "preserve no account of their ages; they think that some evil will attend the numbering of their years."[3]

Superstitious objection to counting in Europe.

Similar superstitions are to be found in Europe and in our own country to this day. The Lapps used to be, and perhaps still are, unwilling to count themselves and to declare the number, because they feared that such a reckoning would both forebode and cause a great mortality among their people.[4]

The superstition in the Highlands of Scotland and the Shetland Islands.

In the Highlands of Scotland "it is reckoned unlucky to number the people or cattle belonging to any family, but more particularly upon Friday. The cowherd knows every creature committed to his charge by the colour, size, and other particular marks, but is perhaps all along ignorant of the sum total of his flock. And fishermen do not care to confess the number of salmon or other fish which they have taken at a draught or in a day, imagining that this discovery would spoil their luck."[5] Though this account is derived from a writer of the eighteenth century, similar superstitions are known to have prevailed in Scotland far into the nineteenth century, and it is probable that they are not extinct at the present time. In Shetland, we are told, "counting the number of sheep, of cattle, of horses, of fish, or of any of a man's chattels, whether animate or inanimate, has always been considered as productive of bad luck. There is also said to have been an idea prevalent at one time, that

[1] James Mooney, "Myths of the Cherokee," *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (Washington, 1900), Part i. p. 424.

[2] R. C. Mayne, *Four Years in British Columbia and Vancouver Island* (London, 1862), p. 313.

[3] Edwin James, *Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains* (London, 1823), i. 235, compare p. 214.

[4] C. Leemius, *De Lapponibus Finmarchiae eorumque lingua, vita, et religione pristina Commentatio* (Copenhagen, 1767), p. 499.

[5] John Ramsay, of Ochtertyre, *Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Alexander Allardyce (Edinburgh and London, 1888), ii. 449.

an outbreak of small-pox always followed the census being taken."[1] Among the fisher folk on the north-east coast of Scotland on no account might the boats be counted when they were at sea, nor might any gathering of men, women, or children be numbered. Nothing aroused the indignation of a company of fisherwomen trudging along the road to sell their fish more than to point at them with the finger, and begin to number them aloud :—

Superstitious objection of Scotch fisher folk to be counted.

"*Ane, twa, three,*
Faht a fishers I see
Gyain our the brigg o' Dee,
Deel pick their muckle greethy ee."[2]

So the fish-wives of Auchmithie, a village on the coast of Forfarshire, used to be irritated by mischievous children, who counted them with extended forefingers, repeating the verse :—

"*Ane, twa, three!*
Ane, twa, three!
Sic a lot o' fisher-wifies
I do see!"

And the unluckiness extended to counting the fish caught or the boats in the herring-fleet.[3]

Superstitious objection to counting lambs in England.

In Lincolnshire "no farmer should count his lambs too closely during the lambing season. This idea is, it may be guessed, connected with the notion that to reckon very accurately gives the powers of evil information which they can use against the objects under consideration. '*Brebis comptées, le loup les mange.*' I have seen a shepherd in obvious embarrassment because his employer knew so little of his own business that, though usually the most easy of masters, he would insist on learning every morning the exact number of lambs his flock had produced. For a cognate reason, it may be, some people when asked how old they are reply, 'As old as my tongue, and a little bit older than my teeth.' M. Gaidoz remarks in *Melusine* (ix. 35)

[1] John R. Tudor, *The Orkneys and Shetland* (London, 1883), p. 173; Ch. Rogers, *Social Life in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1884–1886), iii. 224 *sq.*

[2] Rev. Walter Gregor, M.A., *Notes on the Folk-lore of the North-East of Scotland* (London, 1881), p. 200.

[3] *County Folk-lore*, vol. vii. *Fife*, collected by J. E. Simpkins (London, 1914), p. 418.

that old people ought not to tell their age, and when importuned to reveal it they should answer that they are as old as their little finger. Inhabitants of Godarville, Hainault, reply, 'I am the age of a calf, every year twelve months.'"[1] In England the superstitious objection to counting lambs is not confined to Lincolnshire. A friend, whose home is in a village of South Warwickshire, wrote to me some years ago, "Superstitions die hard. Yesterday I asked a woman how many lambs her husband had. She said she didn't know, then, perceiving the surprise in my face, added, 'You know, sir, it's unlucky to count them.' Then she went on, 'However we haven't lost any yet.' And her husband is postmaster and keeps the village shop, and, in his own esteem, stands high above a peasant."[2]

Superstitious objection to counting chickens, blossoms, fruit, and mice in Denmark.

In Denmark they say that you should never count the eggs under a brooding hen, else the mother will tread on the eggs and kill the chickens. And when the chickens are hatched, you ought not to count them, or they will easily fall a prey to the glede or the hawk. So, too, blossoms and fruit should not be counted, or the blossoms will wither and the fruit will fall untimely from the bough.[3] In North Jutland people have a notion that if you count any mice which the cat has caught, or which you chance to discover, the mice will increase in number; and if you count lice, fleas, or any other vermin, they also will multiply in like manner.[4]

Objection to counting warts, money, loaves, and dumplings.

It is said to be a Greek and Armenian superstition that if you count your warts they will increase in number.[5] On the other hand, it is a popular German belief that if you count your money often it will steadily decrease.[6] In the Upper Palatinate, a district of Bavaria, people think that loaves in the oven should not be counted, or they will not turn out well.[7] In Upper Franconia, another district of

[1] Mabel Peacock, "The Folk-lore of Lincolnshire," *Folk-lore*, xii. (1901) p. 179.

[2] Letter of William Wyse, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, dated Halford, Shipston-on-Stour, 25th February, 1908.

[3] H. F. Feilberg, "Die Zahlen im dänischen Brauch und Volksglauben," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, iv. (Berlin, 1894) p. 383.

[4] H. F. Feilberg, *op. cit.* p. 384.

[5] William Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders* (London, 1879), p. 140.

[6] Adolf Wuttke, *Der deutsche Volksaberglaube*[2] (Berlin, 1869), p. 384, § 633.

[7] A. Wuttke, *op. cit.* p. 378, § 620.

Bavaria, they say that, when dumplings are being cooked, you should not count them, because if you do, the Little Wood Women, who like dumplings, could not fetch any away, and deprived of that form of nutriment they would perish, with the necessary consequence that the forest would dwindle and die. Therefore to prevent the country from being stripped bare of its woods, you are urged not to count dumplings in the pan.[1] In the north-east of Scotland a similar rule used to be observed for a somewhat different reason. "When bread was baked in a family the cakes must not be counted. Fairies always ate cakes that had been counted; they did not last the ordinary time."[2]

The ancient Jewish objection to a census probably based on superstition.

On the whole we may assume, with a fair degree of probability, that the objection which the Jews in King David's time felt to the taking of a census rested on no firmer foundation than sheer superstition, which may have been confirmed by an outbreak of plague immediately after the numbering of the people. To this day the same repugnance to count or be counted appears to linger among the Arabs of Syria, for we are told that an Arab is averse to counting the tents, or horsemen, or cattle of his tribe, lest some misfortune befall them.[3]

Later relaxation of the rule.

At a later time the Jewish legislator so far relaxed the ban upon a census as to permit the nation to be numbered, on condition that every man paid half a shekel to the Lord as a ransom for his life, lest a plague should break out among the people.[4] On receipt of that moderate fee the deity was apparently assumed to waive the scruples he felt at the sin of a census.

[1] August Witzschel, *Sagen, Sitten und Gebräuche aus Thüringen* (Vienna, 1878), p. 285, § 100.

[2] Rev. Walter Gregor, *Notes on the Folk-lore of the North-East of Scotland* (London, 1881), p. 65.

[3] S. R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 332, referring to Burckhardt, *Travels*, p. 741. I have not been able to verify this reference.

[4] Exodus xxx. 11-16. This passage, in the opinion of the critics, belongs to a late section of the Priestly Code, and therefore probably dates from the Exile or later. See the commentaries on Exodus of W. H. Bennett (*The Century Bible*), A. H. McNeile (*Westminster Commentaries*), and S. R. Driver (*The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*). As to the Priestly Code, see above, vol. i. pp. 131 *sqq*.

CHAPTER X

SOLOMON AND THE QUEEN OF SHEBA

The fame of Solomon's wisdom.

ACCORDING to Jewish tradition King Solomon was a sage whose reputation for wisdom spread to the ends of the earth, and from all quarters kings sent envoys to Jerusalem to profit by the sagacity and learning of the Hebrew monarch.[1]

The visit of the Queen of Sheba.

Amongst the rest the Queen of Sheba, not content to receive at second hand the treasures of knowledge which he dispensed to his hearers, came in person from her home in southern Arabia to question Solomon with her own lips and to listen to his wise answers. We are told that she put riddles to him, and that he read them all; not one of them did he fail to answer.[2] What the riddles were which the Queen propounded to the King, the historian omits to tell us, but later Jewish tradition has supplied the blank. The Midrash or commentary on Proverbs contains a list of the Queen's questions and the King's answers. A few specimens may perhaps suffice to convince a modern reader that, if they are genuine, the King's reputation for wisdom was somewhat cheaply earned.

Riddles propounded to Solomon by the Queen of Sheba.

The Queen said to Solomon, "Seven there are that issue and nine that enter; two yield the draught and one drinks." Solomon replied, "Seven are the days of a woman's defilement, and nine the months of pregnancy; two are the breasts that yield the draught, and one the child that drinks it." Then the Queen questioned him further, saying, "A woman said to her son, thy father is my father, and thy

[1] 1 Kings v. 29-34.

[2] 1 Kings x. 1-3. In verse 1 the Hebrew word (חִידוֹת), which the English Version translates "hard questions," should be translated "riddles." It is the same word which is used of Samson's riddle in Judges xiv. 12-19.

grandfather my husband; thou art my son, and I am thy sister." "Assuredly," said he, "it was the daughter of Lot who spake thus to her son." Also the Queen asked him, "What land is that which has but once seen the sun?" Solomon answered, "The land upon which, after the creation, the waters were gathered, and the bed of the Red Sea on the day when it was divided." Further, the Queen said, "There is something which, when living, moves not, yet when its head is cut off it moves." "It is the ship in the sea," answered Solomon. Again, "What is this?" asked the Queen. "It comes as dust from the earth, its food is dust, it is poured out like water, and it lights the house." "Naphtha," replied the King curtly.

How the Queen of Sheba proved Solomon's wisdom by practical tests.

But besides plumbing the depths of the King's wisdom by these searching questions, the Queen of Sheba is said to have further submitted his practical sagacity to certain experimental tests. Thus, she placed a number of males and females of the same stature and garb before him and said, "Distinguish between them." Forthwith Solomon made a sign to the eunuchs, and they brought him a quantity of nuts and roasted ears of corn. The males, who were not bashful, grasped them with bare hands; but the females took them delicately, putting forth their gloved hands from beneath their garments. Whereupon King Solomon cried out, "Those are the males, these the females." Moreover, she brought before him a number of men, some circumcised and others uncircumcised, and she asked him to distinguish between them. He at once made a sign to the high priest, who opened the ark of the covenant, whereupon the circumcised men bowed their bodies to half their height, while their countenances shone with the radiance of the Shekinah; but the uncircumcised men fell prone upon their faces. "Those are circumcised," quoth he, "these uncircumcised." "Thou art wise indeed," quoth she. Afterwards the Queen ordered the sawn trunk of a cedar tree to be brought, and she asked Solomon to point out at which end the root had been, and at which the branches. He bade her cast it into the water, whereupon one end sank and the other floated on the surface. The sagacious monarch then declared that the end which sank was the root end, and that the end which floated was

the branch end. This proof of his penetration filled the Queen with admiration. "Thou exceedest in wisdom and goodness the fame which I heard," cried she, "blessed be thy God!"[1]

Contest of wit between Solomon and Hiram, King of Tyre.

The Queen of Sheba was not the only potentate with whom the royal sage at Jerusalem is reported to have engaged in a contest of wit. It is said that Solomon propounded a riddle to Hiram, King of Tyre, laying a wager that he could not read it. The Tyrian monarch accepted the challenge, but though he puzzled over the problem, he could not find the answer. So Solomon won his wager. But his triumph was short-lived. For a man of Tyre, named Abdemon, now came forward as the champion of his king and country, and not only solved Solomon's riddle but propounded one of his own, which the Hebrew sage, for all his wisdom, was unable to read.[2]

Contests of wit between two rival Rajahs of Celebes.

The iron staff and the tube of sago.

In Central Celebes similar stories are told of contests of wit between the rival Rajahs of Loowoo and Mori. It is said, for example, that the Rajah of Mori, hearing reports of the other's greatness, resolved to test his power and glory. For this purpose he sent him an iron staff bent into a loop, with a request that he would straighten it out. The Rajah of Loowoo put the staff in a furnace, and when it was red-hot, he straightened it out, as he had been requested to do. Having performed the task set him, he now in his turn tested his rival by sending the Rajah of Mori a tube of sago, baked in a bamboo and bent into a loop while it was still warm. This tube he begged the Rajah of Mori to straighten out. The Rajah of Mori accordingly set to work on the tube of sago, but do what he would, he could not straighten it out. If he tried to do it when the sago was dry, the tube threatened to break in his hands; if he tried to do it when the sago was damp, by being dipped in water, the tube dissolved; and if he warmed it up to dry it again, the sago melted into a solid mass. So in this trial of skill the Rajah of Loowoo got the better of the Rajah of Mori.

[1] Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, iv. (Philadelphia, 1913) pp. 145-148; C. H. Toy, "The Queen of Sheba," *The Journal of American Folk-lore*, xx. (1907) pp. 208 *sq.* On the riddles of the Queen of Sheba, as they are reported by Jewish and Arab tradition, see further the learned dissertation of W. Hertz, "Die Rätsel der Königin von Saba," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1905), pp. 413 *sqq.*

[2] Josephus, *Antiquit. Jud.* viii. 5. 3; *id.*, *Contra Apionem*, i. 17.

The cotton and the bark-cloth.

However, in another story the Rajah of Mori contrives to defeat his rival. The Rajah of Loowoo had sent him a piece of cotton with a request that he would draw out all the threads. This the Rajah of Mori contrived to do, and having executed the task, he sent the Rajah of Loowoo in return a piece of bark-cloth with a request that the Rajah would be so good as to draw out all the threads from *that*. In vain the Rajah of Loowoo struggled to disentangle all the fibres of the bark; at last he had to give it up and acknowledge that the Rajah of Mori was at least his peer.

The snuffing of the torch.

Yet another story, however, reverses the parts played by the two potentates and assigns the superiority to the Rajah of Loowoo. It is said that the Rajah of Loowoo came to visit the Rajah of Mori, and that the two sat up late at night talking by the light of a resin-torch, after all the other folk in the palace had gone to sleep. As the torch guttered and threatened to go out, the Rajah of Mori took a stick and directed the flow of resin so that the flame burst out again as bright as ever. Now this is a task which is usually performed by a slave, and the good-natured Rajah only did it with his own hands because all his slaves were abed. However, his astute rival at once took advantage of his politeness to place him in a position of inferiority. "Because you have snuffed the torch," said he to the Rajah of Mori, "you are less than I, and you must pay me homage." The crestfallen but candid Rajah of Mori acknowledged the justness of the observation, and confessed the superiority of the Rajah of Loowoo.[1]

If we had the Queen of Sheba's version of her interview with King Solomon, we might perhaps discover that in the war of wit she was at least able to hold her own against the Hebrew monarch.

Story in the Koran of Solomon, the Queen of Sheba, and the crystal floor.

In the dreary wilderness of the Koran, which by comparison with the glorious literature of the Old Testament remains an eternal monument of the inferiority of the Arab to the Hebrew genius, we read how Solomon tested the discernment of the Queen of Sheba by overlaying his court of audience with glass, and how the Queen of Sheba, falling

[1] N. Adriani en Alb. C. Kruijt, *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradja's van Midden-Celebes* (Batavia, 1912–1914), i. 135.

into the trap, mistook the glass for water and drew up her skirts to wade through it.[1] Later Arab tradition has not unnaturally dwelt by predilection on the visit of a native Arab princess to the wise king at Jerusalem, and has adorned or disfigured the simple theme by many fanciful details. Among the rest it enlarges on the trivial incident of the glassy pavement. Envious or malignant demons had whispered, so it is alleged, in Solomon's ear that the Queen had hairy legs or the feet of an ass, and in order to prove or disprove the truth of the accusation the sage king resorted to the expedient of the crystal floor. When the Queen raised her skirts to wade through the imaginary water, Solomon saw that the story of her deformity was a vile calumny, and, his too susceptible heart receiving a strong impression of her charms, he added her to the numerous ladies of his harem.[2] At Jerusalem the legend is told to this day, and the very spot where the incident happened is pointed out. It is a few yards within the gate called Bâb el Asbât, or the Gate of the Tribes, the only gateway now left open in the eastern wall of the city. Here down to the summer of 1906 there stood an old bath house, which dated from the days of the Saracens, but which, according to tradition, had been built by King Solomon for the use of the Queen of Sheba.[3]

King Duryodhana and the crystal floor in the *Mahabharata.*

The deception of the crystal pavement occurs also as an incident in the great Indian epic, the *Mahabharata.* We there read how on one occasion the dull-witted king Duryodhana mistook a sheet of crystal for a sheet of water, and tucked up his skirts to wade through it; how another time he on the contrary mistook a lake of crystal water for dry land, and fell splash into it with all his clothes on, to the amusement of the spectators and even of his own servants; how he tried to pass through a crystal door, which he supposed to be open, but knocked his brow against its hard surface till his head ached and his brains reeled; and how

[1] *The Qur'ân*, chapter xxvii., translated by E. H. Palmer (Oxford, 1880), Part ii. p. 103 (*The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. ix.).

[2] W. Hertz, "Die Rätsel der Königin von Saba," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1905), pp. 419 *sqq.* In Arab tradition the Queen's name is Balqîs.

[3] J. E. Hanauer, *Folk-lore of the Holy Land* (London, 1910), pp. 97 *sqq.*

after this painful experience, he came to an open door, but turned away from it, because he feared to encounter the obstruction of crystal again.[1]

Did the Koran borrow the story from the *Mahabharata*?

Despite the resemblance between the two stories in the Koran and the *Mahabharata*, neither the prophet nor the poet can well have copied directly the one from the other, the prophet because he did not read Sanscrit, and the poet because he died before the prophet was born.[2] If they did not both draw independently from the well-spring of fancy an incident, for the creation of which an imagination less than Miltonic might conceivably have sufficed, they may have borrowed it from a popular tale which circulated alike in the bazaars of India and the tents of Arabia.

[1] *The Mahabharata*, translated literally from the original Sanskrit text, edited by Manmatha Nath Dutt, *Sabha Parva* (Calcutta, 1895), chapter xlvii. 3-13, p. 64. Compare Christian Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, i.[2] (Leipsic, 1867) p. 825; Sir George A. Grierson, "Duryodhana and the Queen of Sheba," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1913* (London, 1913), pp. 684 *sq.*, with the notes of W. Crooke, pp. 685 *sq.*, and Mr. C. H. Tawney, p. 1048. The latter scholar cites another parallel in an Indian tale, which was pointed out by F. Anton von Schiefner: "In the *Jyotishkāvadāna*, p. 108, artificial fishes which can be set in motion by machinery, appear under a crystal floor. The entering guest takes this for water, and is about therefore to take off his shoes" (F. Anton von Schiefner, *Tibetan Tales*, done into English from the German, with an Introduction, by W. R. S. Ralston, London, 1882, p. 361 note [2]). In the Jerusalem version of the story a stream of water, with fish swimming in it, flowed under the crystal pavement (J. E. Hanauer, *Folklore of the Holy Land*, p. 97).

[2] The enormous Indian epic, the *Mahabharata*, was doubtless the work of many hands and many ages, but inscriptions prove that the poem was reduced, or rather expanded, to its present size before 500 A.D.; Mohammed was born about 570. A.D. See *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), ii. 235; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, xvi. (Edinburgh, 1878) p. 545.

CHAPTER XI

THE JUDGMENT OF SOLOMON

Solomon's test of motherhood.

OF the proofs of Solomon's extraordinary wisdom, which the Hebrew historian has recorded, the most celebrated is the mode whereby, in a dispute between two wenches for the possession of a child, of which both claimed to be the mother, he distinguished the real from the pretended parent by ordering the infant to be cut in two and divided between the claimants; whereupon, maternal affection overmastering all other feelings, the real mother begged that the child might be spared and given alive to her rival, while the pretended mother was quite ready to acquiesce in the bisection of the babe.[1]

Repetition of the story of the test in Jain literature.

Like much else that is told of King Solomon, this anecdote has the air rather of a popular tale than of an historical narrative. True or false, it has passed into folk-lore, having been incorporated into that vast legendary literature of the Jains, which as yet has been only partially explored by European scholars. Four of these Indian versions of the story have been discovered in recent times;[2] they all bear a family resemblance to each other and to their Hebrew original. It will be enough to cite one of them, which runs as follows:—

A Jain version of the judgment of Solomon.

A certain merchant had two wives; one of them had a son and the other had not. But the childless wife also took good care of the other's child, and the child was not able to distinguish, "This is my mother, that is not." Once on a time the merchant, with his wives and his son, went to another country, and just after his arrival there he died.

[1] 1 Kings iii. 16-28.

[2] L. P. Tessitori (Udine, Italy), "Two Jaina versions of the Story of Solomon's Judgment," *The Indian Antiquary*, xlii. (1913) pp. 148-152. The writer gives all four versions; two of them had previously been published by his fellow-countryman F. L. Pulle. As to Jain literature, see *The Imperial Gazetteer of India, The Indian Empire* (Oxford, 1909), i. 415; J. Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vii. (Edinburgh, 1914) p. 467.

Then the two wives fell to quarrelling. One of them said, "Mine is this child," and the other said just the same. One said, "It is I who am the mistress of the house;" and the other said, "It is I." At last they carried the dispute before a royal court of justice. The presiding minister of justice gave an order to his men, "First divide the whole property, then saw the child in two with a saw, and give one part to the one woman and the other part to the other." But when the mother heard the minister's sentence, it was as if a thunderbolt, enveloped in a thousand flames, had fallen on her head, and with her heart all trembling as if it had been pierced by a crooked dart, she contrived with difficulty to speak. "Ah, sire! Great minister!" she said, "it is not mine, this child! The money is of no use to me! Let the child be the son of that woman, and let her be the mistress of the house. As for me, it is no matter if I drag out an indigent life in strange houses; though it be from a distance, yet shall I see that child living, and so shall I attain the object of my life. Whereas, without my son, even now the whole living world is dead to me." But the other woman uttered never a word. Then the minister, beholding the distress of the former woman, said, "To her belongs the child, but not to that one." And he made the mother the mistress of the house, but the other woman he rebuked.[1]

[1] L. P. Tessitori (Udine, Italy), "Two Jaina versions of the Story of Solomon's Judgment," *The Indian Antiquary*, xlii. (1913) p. 149. This version of the "story is from the *Antarakathâsaṃgraha* of Râjasekhara, a work apparently of the fourteenth century.

END OF VOL. II

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*

00067308

4 JUL 1962
20 JUL 1962
L 3 SEP 1962
31 DEC 1984
30 NOV 1987

Digitized with financial assistance from
Mr. N. B. Daruwala
on 25 February, 2019